

PROMOTING POSITIVE ETHNOLINGUISTIC IDENTITY IN THE HERITAGE
LANGUAGE CLASSROOM THROUGH DIALECT AWARENESS

A Dissertation

by

HELEN LISA GARDNER FLORES

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2011

Major Subject: Hispanic Studies

PROMOTING POSITIVE ETHNOLINGUISTIC IDENTITY IN THE HERITAGE
LANGUAGE CLASSROOM THROUGH DIALECT AWARENESS

A Dissertation

by

HELEN LISA GARDNER FLORES

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Richard Curry
Committee Members,	Brian Imhoff
	Rafael Lara-Alecio
	Irene Moyna
Head of Department,	Alberto Moreiras

August 2011

Major Subject: Hispanic Studies

ABSTRACT

Promoting Positive Ethnolinguistic Identity in the Heritage Language Classroom through
Dialect Awareness. (August 2011)

Helen Lisa Gardner Flores, B.A., The Evergreen State College;
M.A., Texas A&M International University

Chair of Committee: Dr. Richard Curry

This study examined dialect awareness as an instructional practice when used to teach Spanish Heritage Language (HL) learners at a university located on the U.S.-Mexico border. The author employed bidialectalism as a theoretical perspective, recognizing the important role that U.S. Border Spanish plays in constructing ethnolinguistic identity. A mixed-methods research framework was used that included a pre-post survey instrument, focus group interviews, and classroom observations to examine HL student confidence toward learning a prestige language variety and attitudes toward speaking U.S. Border Spanish. Discourse analysis was employed to examine the discursive practices of the DA classroom. Quantitative survey results showed that students developed a number of significant attitudinal changes after taking a course infused with dialect awareness. Triangulated qualitative findings confirmed that student attitudes had changed after one semester. The author proposed an agenda for future application of dialect awareness in Spanish Heritage Language classrooms.

To my family,

Thank you for your patience, love, and support from beginning to end.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Little did I know when I began this process how both challenging and fulfilling this dissertation journey would be. I would like to thank the many individuals who have been a source of guidance and inspiration along the way. First, I would like to thank Dr. Richard Curry for his unwavering inspiration and help as my dissertation chair. His good-natured encouragement and guiding editorial comments helped me to believe that I really could finish this project.

I am deeply grateful to Dr. Kati Pletsch de García for encouraging me to pursue sociolinguistic studies and Spanish Heritage language issues in particular. I will never forget that the seed for this research project developed from our many lengthy conversations.

Special thanks to my dissertation committee, Dr. Irene Moyna, Dr. Brian Imhoff, and Dr. Rafael Lara-Alecio, for their constant analytical critique and meticulous examination of this document. Without this support, I know full well that this study would not have come to fruition.

To the many colleagues and friends who have stood by my side, given helpful suggestions, and provided emotional support, I thank you. Your names may remain anonymous, but you have been a constant source of stability and connection in my life. Thank you for the late night calls, the threshing out of ideas, and the wonderful friendships that have been forged throughout this process.

Finally, with great appreciation, I acknowledge the many students who willingly let me observe, interview, and explore the intricacies of Heritage Language Learning.

This is your story. Many, many thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	x
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Problem Statement	2
1.2 Definitions	10
1.2.1. Heritage Language Learner	11
1.2.2 Speech Community	13
1.2.3 U.S. Mexico Border Speech Community	16
1.2.4 U.S. Border Spanish	19
1.2.5 Contact Phenomena.....	21
1.2.6 Dialect Awareness.....	25
1.3. Outline of Study	34
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	36
2.1 An Overview of Language Awareness.....	36
2.2 U.S. Political Context.....	45
2.3 U.S. Spanish Research	49
2.4 Bi-dialect Awareness as a Pedagogical Answer	52
2.5 U.S. Spanish Language Attitudes.....	56
2.6 Discourse Analysis.....	64
3. METHODOLOGY	69
3.1 Course Selection.....	70
3.2 Data Collection Procedures	71
3.3 Dialect Awareness Treatment Exercises	73
3.4 Pre-Post Survey Instrument.....	78
3.4.1 Pre-Survey Instrument.....	79
3.4.2 Post survey Instrument	80

	Page
3.5 Methods of Analysis.....	81
3.6 Population Description.....	82
3.6.1 Birthplace	83
3.6.2 Age	83
3.6.3 Gender	84
3.6.4 Ethnic Identity	85
3.6.5 First Language.....	88
3.6.6 Generation and Language Choice	88
3.6.7 Languages of Education	91
3.6.8 Public Domains	94
3.6.9 Language at Work	97
3.6.10 Spanish Language Skills	98
3.6.11 English Language Skills.....	99
4. ANALYSIS	102
4.1 Internal Survey Correlation	102
4.2 Spanish Confidence Levels	104
4.3 Language Confidence Findings.....	105
4.4 Language Attitudes	106
4.5 Qualitative Survey Analysis.....	108
4.5.1 Open-ended Survey Responses to Dialect Awareness	109
4.5.2 Six Dialect Awareness Exercises	114
4.5.3 Reflective Exercises by Koike and Klee	115
4.5.4 Styles and Registers	118
4.5.5 “Nuevos Mundos”	121
4.5.6 “Cartas a Rosa”	134
4.5.7 Hablar en “F”	138
4.5.8 “Apodos”	143
4.6 Focus Group	153
4.6.1 Physical Border and Language Experiences	154
4.6.2 Higher Education Language Experiences	159
4.6.3 Dialect Awareness Exercise	163
5. CONCLUSION	168
5.1 Summary of Study.....	168
5.2 Limitations	173
5.3 Discussion and Conclusion	175
REFERENCES.....	185

	Page
APPENDIX A	210
APPENDIX B	221
APPENDIX C	227
APPENDIX D	229
APPENDIX E	232
APPENDIX F	239
VITA	241

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1	Place of Birth..... 83
Table 2	Age of Respondents 84
Table 3	Gender of Respondents 84
Table 4	Ethnic Terms 85
Table 5	First Language..... 88
Table 6	Languages Spoken with Grandparents 89
Table 7	Languages Spoken with Parents..... 90
Table 8	Languages Spoken with Siblings and Friends..... 91
Table 9	Language of Education..... 93
Table 10	Public Domains 96
Table 11	Language Use at Work..... 97
Table 12	Language with Colleagues in Different Domains 98
Table 13	Self-Reported Confidence with Spanish 99
Table 14	Self-Reported Confidence with English..... 100
Table 15	Comparison of Spanish and English Language Confidence 101
Table 16	Spanish Language Confidence Pre-Post Results..... 104
Table 17	Spanish in Different Domains Pre-Post Results..... 105
Table 18	Language Attitudes Pre-Post Results 107
Table 19	Appropriate Language Use Pre-Post Results 107
Table 20	Student Approval Rate for DA Exercises and Activities 115

I. INTRODUCTION

Heritage Language Learning (HLL) became a nationally recognized term when, in 1999, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) and the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) collaborated to hold the “first conference on Heritage Languages” in the United States (www.cal.org). Professionals and researchers alike joined to recommend, “an interface between heritage and formal education [that would] encourage and provide effective and efficient language learning” (Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference Report, 2000). Within six years, the U.S. Department of Education supported Heritage Language (HL) research by funding the National Heritage Language Resource Center (NHLRC) at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). Since then, the number of language resource centers has grown to fifteen across the nation, increasing scholarship, training, and language awareness for language professionals. The interface between these three interests has prompted significant research into classroom teaching practices.

The American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP) set the tone to this research by making a clear commitment to HL instruction through the Resolution on the Application of Dialect Knowledge (1997). It states, “all students and teachers should learn scientifically-based information about linguistic diversity and examine the social, political, and educational consequences of differential treatment of

This dissertation follows the style of *Linguistics and Education*.

dialects and their speakers” (AAAL, 1997). The current empirical study follows the intent of this resolution and adds to the body of HL research by examining a classroom instructional approach identified herein as dialect awareness (DA). Through a mixed-methodology, this study examines dialect awareness in the HL classroom. The central question asks if dialect awareness as an instructional approach promotes Spanish heritage language learners’ positive ethnolinguistic identity.

1.1 Problem Statement

In the past 30 years, linguistic and pedagogical research has made considerable strides toward understanding bilingualism. According to several researchers, (Balkan, 1970; Ben-Zeev, 1977; Cummins, 1978; Peal & Lambert, 1962) bilinguals have a ‘cognitive advantage’ over monolinguals. For example, Peal and Lambert (1962) reported that bilingual children functioned at a higher rate than a monolingual control group on non-verbal intelligence and on some measures of verbal intelligence. Similarly, in a study comparing balanced bilinguals and monolinguals, Balkan (1970) found bilinguals to have more flexible thinking capabilities than their monolingual counterparts. Balkan also demonstrated that simultaneous bilinguals who had learned both languages prior to age four were more sensitive to word meanings than either later bilinguals or a monolingual group. These and other studies indicate that learning a heritage language early in life can promote ‘cognitive flexibility.’

Spanish/English bilinguals also have instrumental advantages as the demand for bilingual employees in the U.S. increases. Morsch (2009) reports that bilingual skills are especially needed in the southern and western states where the Spanish-speaking

population is growing rapidly. The report affirms that in general, bilingual salaries surpass monolingual pay rates by 5 to 20 percent. Gingerich (2007) explains that the Hispanic consumer market includes fields as varied as mass media, banking, and technology. The newspaper business alone experienced a 90% increase in the need for skilled bilingual journalists between the years 1970 and 2002, which was primarily due to the expanded circulation of Spanish language newspapers (Nealy, 2008).

In addition to its cognitive and instrumental advantages, bilingualism serves as a networking function that enhances social and cultural connections among people. Having access to two languages enables bilinguals who share the same code to create meaning from ambiguous cultural perspectives and worldviews. The ability to switch and even mix languages allows interactants to integrate cultural nuances into the spoken language. Norms and values are expressed and socialization is reinforced through these bilingual communicative codes (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Thus, speech community members derive meaning through communicating in similar ways, which in turn reinforces speech community identity (Fought, 2006).

In spite of these noted advantages to being bilingual, misconceptions about what it means to be bilingual continue to dominate public discourse in the United States. Individuals who speak two languages are challenged daily to reach an invisible goal of being the “perfect bilingual” (Coryell, Potowski & Clark, 2010). The assumption goes that HL speakers should have well-developed control over grammatical structures and lexicon. They should have a native accent as well as the ability to know subtle pragmatic nuances found in different bilingual contexts. They should also be able to switch between formal

registers, including those found in monolingual public environments and academic domains. Monolingual Spanish speakers as well as Spanish language professionals express this general sentiment. Heritage language learners also voice critical attitudes toward their own language production (Coryell, Potowski & Clark, 2010). As noted by Romaine (1994), this general belief is an oversimplification of bilingualism based upon a monolingual perspective (p. 19). In fact, a bilingual individual's oral skills may fall anywhere along the bilingual continuum, from being equally fluent in most domains to being partially fluent in particular domains. Likewise, literacy levels vary tremendously from individual to individual, and are significantly impacted by the availability, quality, and accessibility of bilingual educational opportunities.

Heritage language speakers not only contend with assumptions of balanced bilingualism, but they also deal with the historical, political, and social ramifications that impact attitudes toward language dominance and diversity. According to Peréa and Coll (2008), political opinion toward bilingualism has fluctuated throughout U.S. history. These authors find that the prevailing trends toward immigration and the perceptions of American identity impact the attitudes expressed toward languages such as Spanish. When public opinion toward immigration is negative, similar opinions are voiced toward the languages spoken by immigrants. Vega (2008) notes that unlike blatant discrimination against particular phenotypes, prejudicial attitudes toward language reflect a more subtle form of discrimination. Such attitudes have been documented by MacGregor-Mendoza (2000), who interviewed Spanish speakers as they described the physical and verbal punishments they received when caught speaking Spanish at school.

Negative societal attitudes exist not only in the public arena, but they also prevail in the university teaching profession. To illustrate this point, Valdés, Fishman, Chávez, and Pérez (2006) describe hierarchical language attitudes that exist in many university Spanish language departments where both native and non-native Spanish speaking professors teach. The authors state that many native Spanish-speaking professors consider Peninsular Spanish to be superior to Latin American Spanish. In turn, professors who hold these attitudes perceive U.S. Spanish to be less prestigious than either Peninsular or Latin American Spanish. The authors claim that this hierarchical ranking reflects attitudes toward the very professors who have different language backgrounds. Consequently, professors who speak U.S. Spanish varieties are considered by some to “speak the wrong kind of language” (p. 261).

The focus on particular content taught in many heritage language classrooms also reflects this attitude. For example, Valdés, Fishman, Chávez, and Pérez (2006) explain that HL university instruction usually emphasizes teaching HL learners a standard dialect, paying particular attention to correcting nonstandard forms found in oral language production (p. 209). This instructional emphasis contrasts with survey responses gathered of Latino professionals, who recommend that HL students develop Spanish language skills relevant to their professional fields, work on practical communication skills that promote cordial interpersonal interactions, and gain knowledge about the larger Panhispanic cultural and historical context to which they are connected (Valdés, Fishman, Chávez, and Pérez, 2006).

Language professors who recognize the complex interplay of language, culture, and identity, yet acknowledge the importance of teaching a standard Spanish language variety, encounter a dialectic tension between validating Spanish vernacular (SV) varieties that HL learners bring to the classroom and teaching Spanish literacy skills and academic, standardized registers. Such concerns come to play when considering the nature of language instruction and how best to impart a Standard Spanish variety to heritage language students. Benjamin (1997) recognizes this tension when he states:

We [Spanish educators] each struggle with how best to teach standard Spanish to speakers of other varieties and with how to provide students the accompanying literacy skills that are necessary in the academic context. The struggle comes from our efforts to strike a healthy balance between honoring these nonstandard varieties of Spanish and our need to expose our students to the larger Spanish-speaking world through the written medium and by necessity through the standard variety. (p. 44)

The same linguistic features that bilingual speakers employ to create belonging and identity within a speech community are labeled as incorrect grammatical usage in prescriptivist language classrooms. When this happens, rather than being encouraged to appreciate and learn different linguistic varieties, HL learners struggle with their self-identity and their language production.

Consequently, it is important to consider the interface between HL language and ethnolinguistic identity when examining pedagogical HL classroom instructional practices. Ethnolinguistic identity is described by Heinz (2001) to be a “complex

relationship among language, communication, culture, and identity” (p. 86). As such, this socially created process is constantly defined and renegotiated when speech community members communicate the parameters that create a common bond among them (Zavala & Bariola, 2010). In identifying culture as central to ethnolinguistic identity creation, Ting-Toomey (1999) clarifies, “culture serves the identity meaning function. Culture provides the frame of reference to answer the most fundamental question of each human being: Who am I? Cultural beliefs, values, and norms provide the anchoring points in which we attribute meanings and significance to our identities” (p.12). Thus, cultural meaning is created, negotiated, and perpetuated through communicative patterns that in turn help to define and reinforce ethnolinguistic identity.

García (2004) found how closely connected ethnic identity and language were for second-generation Mexican American women by documenting their narratives. She states, “without exception, my interviewees reported that the Spanish language resonated throughout their childhood. Their parents, relatives, and Mexican immigrant neighbors spoke if not preferred, Spanish...They viewed Spanish as a constant reminder of their Mexican heritage” (pp. 71-71). García goes on to say, “respondents believe that language is a major factor shaping their ethnic identities” (p. 72). Thus, speaking two languages can help to clarify the ambiguity of living in two different cultural worlds as it directly impacts ethnolinguistic identity. A home front where Spanish is dominant; a community whose history and political power structure has been framed with both languages; a dominant U.S. culture that institutionalizes English; each of these perspectives impacts the bilingual individual, defining experience and language use.

Outsiders' opinions also shape how HL speakers understand their cultural identities (Collier & Thomas, 1988). For example, ascribed viewpoints expressed by out-group interlocutors can create conflicting messages for bilinguals. In this case, out-group members who perceive bilingualism as different can attribute negative connotations to the practice of speaking two languages and/or dialects. If bilingual speakers have an intense affiliation to their ethnolinguistic identity, but others constantly challenge their viewpoints, HL speakers find it difficult to defend personal avowed understandings of their cultural identity (Collier & Thomas, 1988). Consequently, ascribed identity can negatively affect how bilingual individuals perceive themselves. Because these aspects of ethnolinguistic identity have the ability to impact language acquisition and learning, it is important to study them in relationship to the HL classroom.

The interface between HL language instruction and ethnolinguistic identity creates the opportunity to study the underlying attitudes toward stigmatized language varieties that exist in HL classroom. It simultaneously facilitates an inquiry into the possible transformative teaching practices of dialect awareness. The pedagogical implications are clear; instructional practices must create opportunities for students to engage in integrative learning experiences that generate connections between lived experience and language. The phenomenological term "lived experience" made reference to in this study, refers to the practice of utilizing reflective inquiry to arrive at the phenomenon that is being experienced (Burch, 1989; van Manen, 1990). Van Manen (1990) explains, "lived experiences gather hermeneutic significance as we (reflectively) gather them by giving memory to them. Through mediations, conversations, day dreams, inspirations and other

interpretive acts we assign meaning to the phenomena of lived life” (p. 37). In the case of a border speech community, HL speakers create meaning through sharing similar language experiences that can be explored in the classroom. For example, a conversation might be held about “speaking with a stranger in a retail store.” Students may discuss the ease in which they accommodate to a stranger’s speech patterns; what happens in the split second of deciding whether to speak Spanish, English, or a combination of both; what feelings arise from this experience of accommodating to an ‘outsider.’ The entire class may have similar experiences, which can be examined and more deeply understood by intentionally discussing and reflecting upon such situations. Speakers may come to a profound understanding of the lived experience and their shared meaning, which in turn helps them to understand what it means to be bilingual and bicultural.

Consequently, I contend that when instructional practices uphold students’ cultural ways of knowing, value vernacular speech varieties, and encourage students to express their avowed identities, a rich learning experience is in the making. Therefore, teaching and learning practices that create an interface between HL language, culture, communication, and identity will be examined in this study.

To date, Cummins (1996) and Miller (2003) have examined the interplay between bilingual language learning and identity. These studies emphasize the bilingual child in the U.S. school system but do not address the adult heritage language learner. Better known in ethnolinguistic research are Fought (2006) and Zentella (1997), who have investigated different Spanish speaking speech communities in the United States. For example, Fought (2006) analyzed the discourse of Latino and Chicano speech

communities, paying particular attention to the indexing of ethnolinguistic identity through multiple codes. Fought (2006) contends that codeswitching acts as a linguistic symbol of ethnic identity. Similarly, Zentella (1997) examined the interface between language and identity in her renowned work of bilingual Puerto Rican children in New York. Zentella (2002) also examined the experience of transfronterizo students who lived in Tijuana and studied in San Diego. This more recent investigation is telling of similar language and cultural ethnolinguistic experiences found along the Texas/Mexico border where the current study takes place. These studies help to frame the current examination of ethnolinguistic identity and dialect awareness.

Galindo (1996), Pletsch de García (2002), Potowski (2002), Ramírez (2000) and Rivera-Mills (2000) have also conducted language and attitudinal studies. Each has helped to clarify HL learner attitudes toward their use of U.S. Spanish. Other authors who investigate ethnolinguistic identity as it applies to Spanish bilingualism include Bustamante-López (2009), Niño-Murcia and Rothman (2008), Potowski (2002), and Urciuoli (2009). This body of research, which informs the current study, will be examined in the literature review found in Section Two.

1.2 Definitions

The following section provides definitions to key terms used throughout this study. These include the terms *heritage language learner*, *speech community*, *U.S. Border Spanish*, *contact phenomena*, and *dialect awareness*.

1.2.1 Heritage Language Learner

A definition commonly used in pedagogical circles to describe the term ‘heritage language learner’ is taken from Valdés (2001), who states:

Foreign language educators use the term to refer to a language student who is raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken who speaks or at least understands the language, and who is to some degree bilingual in that language and in English (Valdes, 2000a, 2000b). For these educators, the heritage language student is also different in important ways from the traditional foreign language student. This difference, however, has to do with developed functional proficiencies in the heritage languages. (p. 38)

This description refers to individuals who have learned a heritage language yet have had varying degrees of contact with the HL in a primarily English-speaking society. It emphasizes both “source and degree” as factors in language development (Hornberger & Wang, 2008). A home environment provides the source of contact while the degree of language exposure varies tremendously across HLL experiences. This definition also references functional proficiencies, which result from diglossic language situations where a low-prestige language variety maintains certain social functions yet is limited in use within the larger societal dimension (Coulmas, 2005). Such limitations impact HLL language acquisition. For example, HLLs whose range of contact with the heritage language has been limited to particular contexts or domains may display less lexical range or show more simplified syntactic structure than monolingual Spanish speakers (p. 46). Yet, HL learners acquired speaking skills may sound similar to those of

monolingual speakers, surpassing the learned language of L2 learners.

Heritage language learners who live in a bilingual community such as the one under study have a variety of different experiences when it comes to acquiring both languages. This means that many factors affect the development and acquisition of the home language. Two that are particularly important to this study are the sequence of language exposure and the timing of acquisition (Montrul, 2008). The terms ‘simultaneous bilingual’, ‘sequential bilingual’, and ‘adult sequential bilingual’ as used by Montrul (2008) help to identify and explain the different ages of acquisition. For example, ‘simultaneous bilingual’ refers to speakers who are exposed to different family and community languages before the age of three. Montrul states that age 3 is “the approximate age when basic syntactic knowledge is assumed to be in place” (p. 94).

The term ‘sequential bilingual’ denotes individuals who learn a second language after age four (Montrul, 2005). While the home language is learned first, exposure to the second language begins in early childhood. In empirical studies, ‘early sequential bilinguals’ are often divided into age groups, 5-7, 8-10, 11-13 to distinguish their age and cognitive development (Jia et al, 2006). This terminology refers to the critical period hypothesis, which suggests that in childhood a ‘window of time’ exists when language is more easily acquired and resembles the spoken language of a native speaker. Although researchers differ in their opinions, the most prevalent theory claims that the crucial period ends at puberty (Krashen, 1975). In contrast to early sequential bilinguals, adult learners begin acquiring a second language after the critical period of development. These L2 learners are termed ‘sequential’ or ‘late bilinguals’ to

distinguish them from early sequential bilinguals.

The term “heritage language learner” as applied to this study also recognizes that different socio-historical and socio-linguistic influences affect HL acquisition. Macro socio-historical factors include the historical and political forces that impact language maintenance and change. Geographic location, economic infrastructure, familial ties, and speech community membership all contribute to creating the social factors that prompt ethnolinguistic vitality. These macro factors also affect attitudes toward learning the HL in an academic setting. Thus, the definition of Heritage Language Learner used in this study recognizes different layers of influence, the micro influences of home environment and personal development, as well as the overarching macro factors that affect speech communities and the individuals that reside therein. Consequently, when used in this study, the term ‘Heritage Language Learner’ refers to an individual who has acquired Spanish in the home environment, is native or foreign born, and is either a simultaneous or an early sequential bilingual. It also recognizes that the HLL has multiple motivating factors and important social influences that should be taken into account when discussing instructional practices in the classroom environment.

1.2.2 Speech Community

The term “speech community” is commonly found both in ethnographic and sociolinguistic research. Romaine (1994) provides a clear definition when she states, “a speech community is a group of people who do not necessarily share the same language, but share a set of norms and rules for the use of language. The boundaries between speech communities are essentially social rather than linguistic...A speech community is

not necessarily co-extensive with a language community” (p. 22). This definition suggests that speech community members accommodate to interactants’ language use, relying upon cultural clues and implicit social rules to guide communicative interaction. In English-Spanish bilingual communities like the one being studied, common underlying cultural understandings are reflected in dual language use, bicultural discourse patterns, and cross-linguistic paralinguistic features.

A second definition that helps to clarify how this term is used in the current study states, “membership is determined by consensus about community norms but not by conformity in their use, thus allowing people the latitude to express their diversity within communities” (Chambers, 2006, p. 351). This general definition presents the limitations that exist when attempting to define and explain group coherence. Even though norms may imply a static non-changing concept, cultures and the language varieties that express cultural content are dynamic, ever changing. Individual experiences within a speech community vary tremendously and language practices express diverse cultural interpretations. Consequently, the term ‘speech community’ as used in this study refers to a group of people who share similar linguistic and communication norms, while it also reflects that community members vary their ways of speaking depending upon the context and domain in which members communicate.

The work of Fishman (2007) and Milroy (1980) also serves as a framework to describe the U.S.-Mexico border speech community where this study is conducted. Fishman (2007) first developed the concept of domain analysis, which recognizes that social life is structured around ‘contexts of interaction,’ where social domains influence

language choice in multilingual societies. These influences differ in each speech community. For example, formal domains at the ‘societal-institutional level’ might include governmental institutions, education, mass media and services. Informal institutional domains include industry, religion, and culture. Language use in bilingual or multi-lingual communities varies in these public settings. One language may be preferred over another in certain domains while codeswitching may be more common in others. A description of these language variations in public domains helps to identify the prestige warranted each language.

In addition, Fishman (2007) identified social domains such as the family, friends and community as strong indicators of social cohesion and language use. The extended family domain serves as an example since it plays an especially important function in providing younger generations with language role models. When young children communicate with their grandparents in the heritage language, they learn the role relations that comprise this familial interaction (Fishman, 2007, p. 60), which sustains language maintenance and provides communicative models of social interaction.

Milroy (1980) recognized social networks as another means of determining language maintenance and change. First-order networks include family and friends whose sphere of influence acts to reinforce linguistic norms, creating strong links to vernacular speech forms. Milroy substantiated this concept through an empirical study in Belfast, Northern Ireland that examined the strength of network ties in different contexts. Results showed that the more individuals had close contact with persons and participated in activities in the social network, the more they used non-standard language

forms. This finding demonstrated that when social networks are relatively isolated socially and/or geographically, vernacular forms are reinforced and tend to withstand pressures to assume linguistic norms found outside the speech network (p. 550). Both domain analysis and social network analysis help to explain the vernacular language usage found at the U.S.-Mexico border.

1.2.3 U.S. Mexico Border Speech Community

This study was conducted at Texas A&M International University in Laredo, Texas, located on the border of the United States and Mexico. Many bilingual business and social networks contribute to language maintenance and language change in this city, where 95% of the population is of Hispanic origin. According to the U.S. Census, 92% of the population speaks Spanish in the home as a primary language. Spanish is also commonly heard in both public and social domains, and interlocutors have extended networks in which they use the regional dialect known in this study as U.S. Border Spanish.

The metropolitan area often called Los Dos Laredos includes Laredo, Texas and Nuevo Laredo, Tamaulipas, Mexico. On the northern side of the Río Grande, Laredo, Texas prides itself on being the largest inland port in the United States (<http://www.50states.com/facts/texas.htm>). This city relies heavily upon trade-related jobs, including import/export, transportation and services. According to Texas State facts, Mexican shoppers comprise close to half of the city's retail sales. Heavy reliance upon Mexico for trade and retail sales indicates a comparable level of reliance on bilingual skills. Moreover, most jobs require employees to have Spanish oral

communication skills while some require them to have Spanish literacy skills.

Mass media acts as a prominent indicator of the important role that Spanish plays in this region. Spanish language television, print media, and radio broadcasts represent approximately half of the entire mass media produced in Laredo. Of the 14 television stations broadcast in Los Dos Laredos, six are affiliated with Mexico's major networks (<http://www.stationindex.com/tv/markets/Laredo>). One well-known Laredo channel is KLDO, an affiliate of Univisión and owned by the largest media corporation in Mexico, Grupo Televisa, which presents news and entertainment exclusively in Spanish. Other local channels in Laredo, Texas, give daily newscasts in both English and Spanish while written announcements and commercials appear in Spanish.

In addition to television broadcasts, Laredo, Texas, residents have access to Spanish print material. Nuevo Laredo provides four Spanish newspapers for the Borderplex, and national Mexican newspapers published in Monterrey, Mexico, are found on Laredo newsstands. The main U.S. city newspaper, *Laredo Morning Times*, publishes the news in Spanish as well as in English, and also provides a Spanish on-line site called *El tiempo de Laredo*. The Texas A&M International University student newspaper, *The Bridge*, commonly contains a Spanish language section. Bilingual print material that spans both sides of the Río Grande also includes business magazines such as *Desarrollo Siglo XXI: Información y negocios en comercio exterior* and the glossy socialite magazine, *Femina*, published in Nuevo Laredo.

Finally, numerous Mexican radio stations heard in Laredo, Texas, broadcast talk shows, news commentaries, and diverse music genres in Spanish. Popular music such as

soft and hard rock as well as classical tunes can be heard on these stations. In addition, U.S. radio stations play regional Mexican and Tejano music and transmit local news in Spanish. Of the 21 radio regional stations heard in Laredo, nine define themselves as Spanish-speaking stations while five are identified as Tejano stations, using the local vernacular variety in talk shows and commentaries (http://www.ontheradio.net/metro/laredo_tx.aspx). Consequently, U.S. border residents have a variety of media options in both Standard Spanish and U.S. Border Spanish from which to maintain Spanish language contact.

In addition to the Spanish media options available to the Laredo population, the educational domain provides numerous bilingual and dual language program options. These do not have a uniform design; rather, each school applies bilingual and dual language according to the needs of the student population that it serves. Texas A&M International University, in collaboration with the city's two independent school districts is currently promoting a dual language program known as P-16, spanning from pre-kindergarten through college. If implemented, this plan will provide student access to Spanish reading and writing skills across the region, further validating bilingualism as a desirable language skill.

The pervasive use of Spanish in Laredo's public domains has led Pletsch de García (2008) to assert that both formal English and Spanish maintain a position of High (H) prestige in this border community. Pletsch de García also notes that while the more commonly heard vernacular code, U.S. Border Spanish (see below), holds social value for its speakers, it lacks the prestige garnered by the more Standard or academic forms of

both languages. Thus, while bilingual language usage may appear homogeneous to the casual observer, border language diversity exists across a continuum from both Standard English and Standard Spanish to variations of colloquial mixed code (p. 6). This rich diversity in language expresses the unique bilingual/bicultural borderland experience. The significance is clear: strong ethnolinguistic identity exists at the border, where language and identity are intimately tied to each other. Consequently, this borderland community provides an ideal location in which to examine language attitudes toward U.S. Border Spanish and dialect awareness as a teaching and learning practice.

1.2.4 U.S. Border Spanish

A perusal of the literature indicates that U.S. Spanish dialects have various names, often depending upon the geographical location or territorial demarcation. Some examples include the names Spanish of the Southwest (Bernal-Enríquez, 2000), California Spanish (Arellano, 2000), and New Mexican Spanish (Bills and Vigil, 2000). Vernacular terminology such as “Spanglish” and “TexMex” can also be found in the literature. Since different connotations to these terms exist, I have given considerable thought to determining what term to use in this study.

The anthropological terms ‘emic’ and ‘etic’ help to clarify the reason that dialect naming comes under such scrutiny. “Emic” refers to the examination of language and culture from the insiders’ viewpoint. Researchers who maintain an emic perspective use terminology that reflects what in-group members consider important (Swann, Deumert, Lillis & Mesthrie, 2004). On the other hand, “etic” refers to an objective, scientific perspective observed from an outsiders’ viewpoint. In this case, more generic

terminology is selected to limit the subjective connotations that might arise by using in-group members' terms. Linguistic anthropologists, who employ ethnographic methodologies, tend to use an emic perspective while variationist sociolinguists, who rely upon quantitative methodologies, tend to use the etic perspective. To determine the most appropriate term for this study, I turned to Lipski, who conducted a historic-linguistic overview of U.S. Spanish.

First, Lipski (2008) refers to national identity and language when he distinguishes between U.S. dialects. For example, he prefers to isolate the particular linguistic structures attributable to the countries of origin as found in 'Salvadorian Spanish in the United States', 'Cuban Spanish in the United States', and 'Mexican Spanish in the United States.' Although these terms identify the linguistic heritage of a particular ethnic group, Lipski also recognizes the shortcomings of using these words. He states, "Mexican American Spanish is not a discrete dialect, but a continuum of language-contact varieties encompassing a wide range of abilities in both English and Spanish" (p. 84). He continues by delineating the common linguistic characteristics found in both Mexican and Mexican American Spanish, as well as the divergent characteristics audible in Mexican American Spanish due to contact with English and with other Spanish dialects. Thus, for Lipski, the term 'Mexican American Spanish' represents the tie to a national origin, but it also references the linguistic characteristics that occur in language contact.

In addition, Lipski (2008) details the historical origins of the term 'Spanglish,' linking its primarily pejorative connotation to its coinage in 1954 by Salvador Tío. In

this description, Lipski shows the manifold uses given to the term, referencing numerous authors. He clarifies how previous authors have included multiple purposes in the label and states, “the Spaniard Joaquim Ibarz (2002:3) ...clearly confuses regional and social dialects, youth slang, and language-contact phenomena” (p. 47). Lipski also mentions, however, that the well-respected sociolinguist, Zentella (1997), has used this term and that in-group members have reported that to them Spanglish represents ethnic pride. Although Lipski’s lengthy description clearly recommends avoiding the use of the term Spanglish, it also highlights the ongoing semiotic debate that exists around naming U.S. Spanish dialects.

Similar to Spanglish, the colloquial term “Tex-Mex” has been documented as the term in-group members use to signify the vernacular variety common to the U.S.-Mexico border region (Pletsch de García, 2008). For example, Pletsch de García (2008) conducted an attitudinal study in Laredo, Texas to find in-group perceptions of this term. Findings showed that borderland residents identified Tex-Mex to signify positive, neutral and/or pejorative connotations (Pletsch de García, 2008). In an attempt to maintain neutrality and to reference the geographic region that pertains to this study, I have selected the term U.S. Border Spanish to identify the vernacular variety spoken by the community of speakers in Laredo, Texas.

1.2.5 Contact Phenomena

Much of the linguistic research that has informed language pedagogy has emphasized what Gafaranga calls the “grammatical perspective” (2007). He states that “the aim of grammatical accounts of language alternation should be to demonstrate how

bilingual speakers achieve a sense of uniformity despite diversity, how they use linguistic resources available to maintain a sense of structural orderliness” (p. 38). Linguistic analysis of U.S. Spanish dialects found within the United States (Lipski, 2008) has proven to be particularly fruitful since this is the largest HL speaking group within the United States. Specific contact phenomena found in U.S. Spanish as it pertains to pedagogical inquiry and connects to the precepts of this study will be reviewed below.

Codeswitching is perhaps the most studied phenomenon in U.S. Spanish dialects (Toribio, 2000; Bullock & Toribio, 2009; García & Tallon, 2000; Montes-Alcalá, 2000; Pfaff, 1979; Poplack, 1982; and Zabaleta, 2000). In classic terms, codeswitching (CS) is defined as “the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent” (Poplack, 1979). Inter-sentential CS refers to switches that occur in a conversation while intra-sentential codeswitching identifies switches that happen within a sentence, clause, or phrase. Myers-Scotton (2006) notes that intra-sentential CS particularly interests linguists because it allows for an examination of how two codes work together grammatically to create ‘structural orderliness’. Different aspects of codeswitching that have been researched include the social implications of its use (Jacobson, 2009) as well as the impact that it has had on classroom instruction (Chauncey, Grainger, & Holcomb, 2007), in specific domains (Callahan, 2007) and in writing (Callahan, 2001). Such topics are important to the current study of ethnolinguistic identity and Spanish language instruction especially since many HL learners in this community use codeswitching as a communication norm across both

private and public domains.

Borrowing is another structural feature found in U.S. Spanish. The term refers to different phenomena but particularly describes lexical borrowing, which, according to Bullock and Toribio (2009) involves the “morphological and phonological integration of a single lexeme” (p. 5). Many borrowed terms have been assimilated into U.S. Spanish, becoming formal adaptations. Examples include infinitive verbs such as ‘lonchar’ (to eat lunch), ‘parquear’ (to park), or the nouns ‘lonche’ (lunch) and ‘brecas’ (brakes). In addition, borrowings found in spontaneous bilingual speech not yet incorporated into common usage are known as *nonce borrowings* (Poplack, Wheeler & Westwood, 1989). Some linguists recognize borrowing as having similar characteristics as code-switching (Myers-Scotton, 2006) and consequently analyze the two phenomena together. Other linguists examine lexical borrowing as a separate category. Whichever the perspective, lexical borrowing has been discussed extensively in U.S. Spanish dialect studies. For example, Cantero (2000), Craddock (1976), Clegg (2000), and Lipski (2008) have examined the creation of new vocabulary that has been incorporated into U.S. Spanish dialects. Poplack (1982), Roca (2005), and Silva-Corvalán (1996) have studied *nonce borrowing* that is produced spontaneously in bilingual speech and frequently heard in border speech communities such as the one represented in the current study.

Equally important are loan translations or *calques* and archaisms, linguistic features analyzed in descriptive linguistic studies and applied to the teaching of heritage language learners. Loan translations are idiomatic expressions that keep their native-language morphemes, such as the term ‘escuela alta’ translated from the English ‘high

school'. Lipski (2008) and Otheguy & Stern (2010) provide numerous examples and analyses of such terms found in U.S. Spanish. In contrast, archaisms are lexical items from the Spanish colonial period that fell into disuse with the majority of the population but continued to be used in isolated regional areas. Bilingual communities in New Mexico and the Texas/United States border region still use archaisms such as 'haiga', 'mesmo', and 'ansí' in daily speech. Similar to loan translations, archaisms are stigmatized forms not considered to be part of a standard Spanish language variety. Studies that have shed light on Spanish archaic usage in U.S. speech communities and frame pedagogical application include Blanch (1987; 1989), Lipski (1977), and Sánchez (1972).

In addition to the linguistic terms defined above, two pedagogical terms, 'scaffolding' and 'meta-linguistic awareness' need to be defined as they relate to this study. Scaffolding, as the word suggests, represents a lattice that helps a learner climb to a greater level of understanding by using previous knowledge (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976). When an educator and a learner undertake a task together, the learner concentrates on the task at his or her level of understanding. When the learner has incomplete information, the expert steps in and divulges new knowledge, which assists the learner to accomplish the task. This process is carried out through language, which Antón and Dicamilla (1999) state, "is the critical device for mediating cognitive development" (p. 234). Thus, classroom dialogue becomes a scaffolding tool that stimulates student learning at the students' level of understanding.

According to Tunmer & Herriman (1984), metalinguistic awareness is "the

ability to deliberately reflect upon and manipulate the structural features of spoken language, treating the language system itself as an object of thought as opposed to using the language system to comprehend and produce sentences” (p. 27). The term ‘language awareness’ is similar to metalinguistic awareness in its denotative meaning in that both terms refer to the skill of thinking about language. However, as recognized by Swann et al (2004), language awareness also refers explicitly to knowledge that is taught in schools and reflects a holistic approach to understanding language in a sociolinguistic context. Interestingly, when the term ‘metalinguistic’ is used in HL literature (Valdés, 1997, Webb & Miller, 2000), expressions like “understanding the usefulness of the heritage language”, and “self-monitoring abilities” are frequently used; thus, language awareness refers to skills that both help students understand their own language production and explain linguistic production to others.

1.2.6 Dialect Awareness

The HL linguistic phenomena described above has been stressed in HL language teaching and learning practices throughout the last fifty years. Initially prescriptivist classroom approaches attempted to eradicate the vernacular language variety from HL speech patterns. Yet with expanded understanding of bilingualism through linguistic, sociolinguistic, and cognitive studies, a philosophical change has occurred in language instruction. At least in theory, additive approaches are promoted throughout teacher preparatory coursework. Typically, additive pedagogues promote using bidialectal contrastive analysis to compare vernacular ways of speaking to a ‘standard’ language variety. This underlying philosophy suggests that Standard Spanish can be added to

students' language repertoire without eradicating the vernacular variety.

The term 'bidialectalism' helps to explain the additive approach and philosophical perspective underlying this study. Bidialectism, when applied to the HL classroom, prompts instructors to value the ethnolinguistic backgrounds of diverse HL students. It also promotes the maintenance of the dialect vital to a community of speakers even while students develop a prestige language variety. Silva-Corvalán (2001), who has been instrumental in providing an understanding of bilingual speech communities, clarifies bidialectalism when she states:

...la habilidad de hablar dos dialectos diferentes...según el contexto social. Esta posición ecléctica es motivada por el principio sociolingüístico que plantea que la lengua tiene valor simbólico y que un dialecto dado es símbolo de identificación con el grupo social al que pertenece un individuo, de manera tal que la erradicación de ese dialecto provocaría problemas psicosociales de identificación, con el consecuente problema de desajuste y alienación dentro de una familia, y más ampliamente, dentro de una comunidad. (p. 32)

[...the ability to speak two different dialects...according to the social context.

This eclectic position is motivated by the sociolinguistic principle that suggests that language has symbolic value and that a given dialect is a symbolic representation of social group identification to which an individual belongs.

Erradication of this dialect will create psycho-social problems of identification, and subsequent problems of maladjustment and alienation within the family and more extensively within the community.]

Consequently, this study employs bidialectalism as a theoretical perspective, recognizing the important symbolic role that vernacular dialect plays in creating ethnic speech community identity and coherence. The goal is not to eradicate a way of speaking that is so integrally tied to identity, but to scaffold known ways of speaking and understanding through dialect awareness instruction so that HL students can acquire new forms of language production. This concept provides a foundation for the study of dialect awareness in the HL classroom.

For purposes of description and analysis, I have divided dialect awareness into three thematic areas known as (1) sociolinguistic content, (2) Pan-Hispanic literature and cultural content, and (3) socio-political content. I have identified these broad categories as prevalent themes throughout HL literature and employ them here to describe three distinct yet intersecting areas of instruction found in HL classrooms. First, HL pedagogues consistently recommend that sociolinguistic topics be addressed in HL classrooms (Martínez, 2003; Parodi, 2008; Roca, 1992; Silva-Corvalán, 2001; Webb & Miller, 2000). Topics mentioned in the literature include the linguistic description of regional and social diversity, social variation, language change, and registers. In line with this strand, HL researchers recommend that different pedagogical techniques be used in the classroom. Bidialectal classrooms apply sociolinguistic knowledge by incorporating task-based techniques of comparison into the lesson, intending for learners to understand the similarities and differences between standard and non-standard dialects (Silva-Corvalán, 2001). Two other instructional techniques that are mentioned in the literature include the use of cooperative student groupings and peer tutoring (Valdés,

1997) and an emphasis on HL students' personal and academic interests (Clair and Adger, 1999). Each of these classroom applications recognize the importance of both validating colloquial speech while teaching an academic register.

Within this same sociolinguistic category I have placed the concept of ethnolinguistic connections. For many DA classroom practitioners, the surrounding bilingual community provides an extended classroom where HL students can form strong ethnolinguistic connections (Beaudrie & Ducar, 2005; Romero, 2000). Proponents recognize that HL students whose lives are centered in this community can examine the rich sociolinguistic environment from a unique emic perspective, analyzing the speech patterns and communication practices that are commonplace in their daily lives. When used effectively, this connection to community and language can create a bond between students' lived experience and language learning that promotes pride, acceptance of language varieties, and an increased desire to use Spanish (Beaudrie & Ducar, 2005). Thus, research suggests that by using sociolinguistic content in the classroom, HL students gain greater understanding of their own language production while they learn to develop a Standard Spanish language variety.

The second category, Pan-Hispanic literature and cultural content, is more traditionally associated with language and literature studies, connecting language instruction to the humanities through literature, art, music, and media. Unlike traditional literature classes, however, this HL thematic area also refers to U.S. Latino cultural traditions, the impact of religious practices and familial values, and 'cultural notions' that reflect regional and local Hispanic communities' cultural knowledge. Such topics

are drawn from the speech community's common experiences represented through regional artists' photography, artwork, songs, and poems. These in turn are presented in the HL classroom along with world-renowned authors, filmmakers, and artists. Consequently, different worldviews are introduced that represent both Pan-Hispanic worldviews as well as U.S. Latino and regional or local perspectives.

For the HL learner, then, broad Pan-Hispanic material signifies a connection with cultural roots that prior to their introduction may have been unknown. Authors who cite these cultural perspectives as an essential part of HL language instruction include Parodi (2008), Peyton (2008), and Potowski & Carreira (2004). An example can be observed through current HL textbook materials in *El mundo 21* by Samaniego, Rojas, Ohara & Alarcón (2005), where each section highlights a Hispanophone country or U.S. Spanish-speaking population by briefly explaining geo-historical facts, introducing popular cultural figures, and presenting short literary pieces. These inserts provide cultural information while they introduce HL learners to the literary traditions found in the larger Hispanic global community.

The third thematic area identified here as "socio-political content" deals with issues of power and prestige in language production. Martínez (2003) uses the term 'Classroom Based Dialect Awareness' (CBDA), when referring to this approach, and explains that this social framework augments sociolinguistic thematic content. Martínez states "we should add a social framework that doesn't stop at answering the *what* of variation but that proceeds to answer the *why* of variation as well" (p. 7). This critical perspective advocates an examination of the discourse that propagates social inequality.

In turn, such an examination can promote positive societal transformation (Norton & Toohey, 2004). Students are encouraged to develop their own voices through critical pedagogical inquiry and to find action-oriented responses to the social injustices that keep socially stratified groups from developing to their full potential (Kron, 1998). Proponents of using critical pedagogy in the HL classroom suggest that historical events such as the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1846 and the Spanish-American War of 1898 be examined to exemplify how colonization impacted Spanish in the Southwest United States (Cervantes-Rodríguez & Lutz, 2003; Martínez, 2003, and Valdés, 2001). By understanding the broad-ranging socio-political ramifications of language development, it is suggested that students will better understand their own language production and be better equipped to accept multiple language codes, one for the community of practice and others for academic, professional, and personal enrichment purposes. They will also be ready to provide informed explanations regarding nonstandard language varieties, becoming agents of change.

The dimension of affect also plays a critical role across these three thematic areas. When speaking of second language learners, Bolitho et al. (2003) cite three examples of the affective dimension that are pertinent to this discussion. First, the affective dimension may address attitudes that language learners hold toward the target language in post-colonial situations. Second, language learners may hold prejudicial attitudes toward the target language or its peoples, which can also affect their attitude toward learning a language. Third, language learners may struggle to express who they are while speaking the target language and thus have issues with identity (Bolitho et.al,

2003). These observations can also apply to HL students who may experience negative emotional responses toward learning the heritage language or a standard dialect.

Heritage language literature speaks repeatedly of the need to infuse a strong sense of affect into instructional practices. For example, Parodi (2008), who terms the affective dimension ‘psychological skill development,’ recognizes that HL learners commonly exhibit apprehension toward learning a prestige language (Parodi, 2008). Likewise, Potowski and Carreira (2004) acknowledge that affective needs are just as important as other knowledge-based needs in the HL classroom. Romero (2000), who examined Spanish classes at three high schools, found that the use of affective skills promoted a positive change in student behaviors, which in turn contributed to student success.

These thematic areas appear in a number of articles, suggesting that HL learner needs can be met by using holistic instructional approaches more typical of native language arts classes than of second language classes (Potowski & Carreira, 2004; Schwarzer & Petron, 2005; and Webb & Miller, 2000). Although the words ‘thematic approach’ have been used in the current study, the term, ‘model,’ is becoming more prominent in the literature as researchers repeatedly refer to infusing comparable content areas into instruction (Carrasco & Riegelhaupt, 2003, Parodi, 2008). For example, Parodi (2008) recommends a method that features psychological and attitudinal issues, linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects of language, and cultural studies (pp. 211-212). Similarly, Carrasco and Riegelhaupt (2003), who developed a holistic model called META with similar attributes, describe the meta-skills as linguistic, cognitive,

psychological, and cultural knowledge. They recommend that the META model be used for both application in the classroom and for theoretical development.

Even though dialect awareness approaches are promoted in the literature in various formats, especially in African American Vernacular English (AAVE) language research (Rickford, 2006; Seigel, 2006), few studies explore dialect awareness treatment in Spanish HL classrooms. Furthermore, as noted by Valdés, Fishman, Chávez & Pérez (2006), the majority of university Spanish language programs do not apply dialect awareness into the curriculum. For this reason, it is necessary to examine Spanish HL students' perceptions, experiences, and beliefs toward what happens in the classroom when dialect awareness is implemented in the HL Spanish classroom. The intent is to determine whether dialect awareness as an instructional practice helps to validate students' ethnolinguistic identity while it also prompts students' confidence in speaking a Standard Spanish variety.

Kells (2006), supports the need to understand students' perspectives when she states:

Without new sociolinguistic and applied linguistic research connecting language attitudes to literacy practice, our understanding of the role of ethnolinguistic identity in the retention of Mexican American students at the college level will remain speculative and superficial. Furthermore, understanding our students' beliefs and attitudes remains critical to framing appropriate and effective classroom practice. (p. 193)

I agree that it is of imperative importance to examine Spanish HL students'

attitudes toward their own language production and ethnolinguistic identity as they experience HL instructional practices. Heritage language speakers are changing the face of the United States, visible through an increase in linguistic pluralism across the nation. Likewise, the shifting face of the foreign language classroom indicates that prescriptive attitudes that alienate a growing student population will no longer work. Consequently, instructional methods employed in heritage language classrooms must be examined to determine their value to the student population for which they are intended.

The current study, then, examines teaching and learning practices that inform Heritage Language learning. Through a mixed-method approach, the study examines dialect awareness in HL Spanish classroom settings where a majority of students are language and bilingual education teaching majors. The research questions that guide this inquiry include the following:

Research Question #1: RQ 1: Does dialect awareness increase HL student confidence in learning a prestige language variety?

Research Question #2: RQ 2: Does dialect awareness treatment impact student attitudes toward Spanish vernacular varieties?

First a survey method was used to obtain pre- and post-student responses to an in-class dialect awareness treatment. Students recorded their attitudes toward speaking a vernacular language variety and toward learning a standard language variety. A post-survey instrument collected students' language attitudes after receiving DA treatment. Pre and post survey results were analyzed to examine what attitudinal changes, if any, occurred by the end of the semester-long classes. Open-ended questions described

student responses toward particular treatment activities.

Two subsequent questions were also asked:

RQ 2-1: If the answer to one or both of these questions is affirmative, what classroom practices do students identify as positively impacting their learning?

RQ 2-2: If the answer to one or both of these questions is negative, what other classroom practices do students identify as positively impacting their learning?

To examine these questions, I used different qualitative methods, incorporating data from classroom observations and focus group interviews into the descriptive analysis. I then applied discourse analysis to elucidate the discursive processes that were used in the dialect awareness treatment classroom. Focus group conversations captured on audiotape were subsequently transcribed and analyzed to examine the interface between students' representation of ethnolinguistic identity and their reactions to DA language teaching practices. This methodological process made it possible to triangulate the findings.

1.3 Outline of Study

This dissertation is comprised of five (5) sections. After this introduction, Section 2 contains the literature review, which includes several sections. The first section traces the historical trajectory of dialect awareness as a pedagogical teaching strategy from its British roots to the U.S. Spanish language classroom. Next comes an overview of U.S. Spanish linguistic research that has impacted HL teaching and learning practices. The section then turns to ethnolinguistic identity and attitudinal studies toward U.S. Spanish.

Section 3 describes the methodological design, which includes an examination of the survey instrument and the classroom observation techniques used in the analysis. Section 3 also contains demographic and language use information regarding the HL population. This description informs the reader of the prevalent nature of Spanish language use in both formal institutional and less formal, social domains at the U.S./Mexico border.

Section 4 then presents the analyses. The first section discusses the statistical findings that were obtained through the pre/post survey responses for the sample being studied. Following this analysis, a qualitative analysis describes both discourse analysis and focus group interviews. Excerpts of classroom discourse are analyzed to examine student discussions regarding bilingualism and the application of DA exercises used in the treatment class. The discourse is also examined to analyze the role that the vernacular speech code plays in teaching Standard Spanish. Section 4 closes with an examination of three focus group discussions that triangulate the quantitative and qualitative findings. The results provide a cumulative picture of students' language attitudes after receiving Spanish language instruction through the dialect awareness approach. Finally, Section 5 presents the discussion and conclusion.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Dialect awareness as a pedagogical approach has its historical roots in linguistics, pedagogy, and social policy. Its philosophical perspectives and practices span a broad spectrum of educational domains including elementary and secondary language arts, second language studies, and adult heritage language programs. As a result, research from each discipline will be explored and brought to bear. First, Language Awareness, the predecessor of dialect awareness, will be examined in a chronological framework, highlighting the social issues that prompted the rise of heritage language instruction. Since the present study examines students who hold the dual roles of heritage language learners and pre-service teachers, it is anticipated that dialect awareness may impact both their personal learning in the Spanish classroom and their future teaching approaches with bilingual children. Therefore, this review will first provide a broad overview of Language Awareness as it developed in K-12 educational arenas and then examine dialect awareness as it specifically applies to Spanish heritage language learning. Following is a review of U.S. Spanish linguistic and pedagogical studies that have impacted current HL instructional practices. Finally, this literature review will address attitudinal studies toward Spanish as a heritage language and the current literature that presents dialect awareness as a teaching method for the Spanish HL classroom.

2.1 An Overview of Language Awareness

The term “Language Awareness” was first used by Halliday (1975) and later developed as a holistic language approach by Hawkins (1979) in Great Britain. Tulasiewicz and Adams (1998) define the term as,

the study of language based on the latest linguistic and pedagogic principles underlying mother tongue and modern foreign language teaching It envisages the use of language across three dimensions of human development: instrumental, affective and emancipatory. Together they cover the needs of a mother tongue education, which is to empower the pupil (emancipatory outcome), to encourage national and international communication (instrumental aim) and to release the creative (affective) dimension of language. (p. 394)

In 1973, British applied linguists and pedagogues who convened at a conference on Language in the Middle Years of Secondary Education, first discussed Language Awareness as a possible addition to school curriculum (Hawkins, 1999). This came about in response to the growing discontent with language teaching approaches in British schools (Tulasiewicz, 1997, p. 92). Tulasiewicz reports that the decade of the 1970s experienced an educational climate of disciplinary silos that impeded collaboration between foreign languages, language arts, and English-as-a-Second-Language professionals. The concept of educational silos, or teaching content areas independent of each other, is now common jargon used in pedagogical circles. However, in the 1970s, holistic teaching approaches were a relatively new concept. Language professionals' efforts to prepare primary students for secondary education were thwarted by a lack of clear curriculum linkages or continuity.

This decade also was impacted by the emergence of linguistic pluralism in European classrooms (Tulasiewicz, 1997). The influx of immigrant student populations prompted negative attitudinal issues, as monolingual English-speaking students displayed

minimal tolerance toward students who spoke languages other than English. While attitudes of entitlement pervaded mainstream monolingual student populations, immigrant populations contended with issues of low self-esteem and disenfranchisement in the mainstream monolingual school system. As a consequence, a language curriculum was needed that would bridge the marked gaps between primary and secondary language arts and foreign language studies, while promoting positive attitudes toward a diverse population (Simard & Wong, 2004).

In response to these concerns, Hawkins (1999) reports that in 1974 he called for “a new subject, ‘language’, to be taught as a ‘bridging subject’, linking English and the foreign language in the curriculum” (p. 124). The underlying idea was that by fomenting linguistic awareness in these respective language classes, monolingual students could increase their knowledge about languages, improve their written expression, and also grow to appreciate the languages and dialects of a diverse student population. Immigrant students could develop their use of a Standard English language variety while they simultaneously examined prejudicial language attitudes in the society that surrounded them. Proponents believed the latter concern to be an important step in helping students to develop a prestige language variety. As expressed by Hawkins (1999),

failure by many pupils to learn the written form of Standard English was one to which modern linguists were perhaps especially sensitive, having served their apprenticeship as linguistic underdogs in foreign speech communities. From their experiences as foreign language students, linguists understood how failure to

master the standard language variety, especially in its written form could
 ‘disempower’ young learners. (p. 127)

In this way, linguists reasoned that a holistic approach would help immigrant students to develop a particular skill set while it also addressed students’ insecurities and promoted a critical dialogue about language.

Language Awareness, also recognized in curricular development circles as “Knowledge about Language” (KAL), soon spread to other European countries and to Canada, where its multilingual/multicultural framework was promoted. Although content varied across programs, the affective, cognitive, and performative learning domains were considered fundamental building blocks of Language Awareness. At a later date, James & Garrett (1991) expanded the framework to include five domains for LA: “affective, social, power, cognitive and performance.” These five have been consistently mentioned throughout current literature (Svalberg, 2007; Yiakoumetti, Evans & Esch, 2005).

To advance this curricular structure, three pedagogical tools were utilized: metalinguistic awareness, sociolinguistic information, and language skill development, each of which will be described below. Metalinguistic awareness (MA) became a cornerstone to LA practice. Practical metalinguistic application promoted analysis of both natural language and written texts for students to interact with material that could in turn be discussed with their peers. Proponents suggested that this two-fold analysis of text and discussion with peers, promoted deep learning through both individual and cooperative learning. Metalinguistic awareness, when used in the monolingual English classroom, encouraged students to reflect upon their language use, to analyze its

construction, and to consider how meaning is created. Andrews (2006) explains this interconnected learning process when he states:

The school learner becomes more adept with language, and can use language more spontaneously, and with increasing levels of elaboration and precision, then thoughts and ideas - that is to say, meanings of more complex nature can be formed, articulated, synthesized, and evaluated by the language user. Thus, as students grow in language, they continue to grow through language. (p. 14)

Such a connection was said to increase a deeper understanding of language use, which in turn would allow students to examine prevalent societal attitudes toward languages and dialects.

Language Awareness promoted this type of classroom dialogue within a sociolinguistic framework. It also supported the precept that standard and non-standard language varieties are rule-governed even though standardized varieties are deemed more prestigious. As a result, students explored terms such as dialect and language from linguistic rather than from a lay perspective. Nonstandard variations found in social and regional dialects were legitimized as students discovered that all dialects were constructed from underlying rule-governed principles. In addition, students visited communities of practice, experienced cultural exchange events in school, and opened dialogue with minority groups. Proponents suggested that this learning process created a more inclusive educational environment where a probable outcome would be multilingual/multicultural tolerance and acceptance (Svalberg, 2007).

Language skill development was incorporated into LA as language professionals reexamined a complete reliance upon communicative methodologies such as the Natural Approach, popular during the 70s and 80s (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Proponents of LA suggested that specific, isolated grammatical concepts also needed to be taught within a contextualized lesson in order for students to incorporate especially difficult concepts into practice (Svalberg, 2007). Thus, researchers suggested that input enhancement could help to clarify grammatical usage. Whereas the Natural Approach used authentic language for students to acquire language through “meaningful input”, language skill development called for a balance between grammatical learning constructs and communicative meaning. As stated by Andrews (2006), “traditional English language arts curriculum typically makes a ... false assumption, namely, that students can control individual aspects of language before they are aware that they exist” (p. 43). To counter this, grammar was contextualized within meaningful communication utterances; yet, structural components were isolated in a text to emphasize the significance and function of language use (Lee & VanPatten, 1995). In practical terms, students were asked to identify specific linguistic features within a text then test what they had learned by articulating the contextualized grammatical item to other learners. By combining meaning and structure, students could then practice and reinforce their learning through finding similar structures within passages (Bolitho et al., 2003). Consequently, language skill development promoted a cyclical learning pattern that created meaning through context, isolated specific grammatical structures, and reinforced learning through textual examples.

Initially, Language Awareness expected students to obtain a prestige discourse variety by using linguistic description rather than by emphasizing a critical perspective. Although different dialects were discussed in the descriptive approach, classroom content did not typically emphasize the issues that surround language acquisition in diglossic situations. Critical discourse advocates have since criticized the original LA methodology for its lack of attention to language and power constructs. Hawkins (1999), has responded to this claim by citing one of his earlier quotes which states:

Linguistic prejudices and snobberies which are endemic in our linguistically naive community are no longer a joke when they interfere with the life chances of large numbers of children...prejudice is nurtured by ignorance and insecurity...the study of language will go beyond, will get outside, English and attempt to help the pupil to look objectively at language behavior. (1979, p. 63)

Thus, Hawkins lays claim to the fact that although critical discourse was not an overt instructional practice, Language Awareness did have an underlying philosophy that recognized the disparities that existed between language varieties.

As the LA methodological construct developed, it became ideologically associated with a critical discourse perspective developed by Fairclough (1989) known as Textually Oriented Discourse Analysis (TODA). The TODA theoretical premise that Language Awareness is best expressed by Fairclough (1989) who states, “Discursive practice ...contributes to reproducing society (social identities, social relationships, systems of knowledge and belief) as it is, yet also contributes to transforming society” (p. 65). By examining how discourse is intricately related to power relations, both immigrant ESL

students and monolingual English students learning foreign languages could examine hidden ideologies imbedded within language and texts. As expressed by Bolitho, et al. (2003), “Transformed Practice... implies that the result of the awareness-raising work will not just be improved language use, but also language use which is more sensitive to issues of culture, identity, and equity” (p. 254). Proponents suggested that this awareness-raising instructional practice would encourage sociolinguistic tolerance among diverse student populations and ultimately promote answers to inequities in a multilingual global environment.

This comprehensive approach to language instruction met with widespread acceptance in European school systems, and researchers soon turned to empirical evidence to examine its claims (Candelier, 2004; Simard & Wong, 2004). An extensive, longitudinal study that dealt particularly with attitudinal changes was the EVLang (L’*évaluation Aux Langues Dans L’École Primaire*). This LA project (1997-2000) extended across Austria, France, Italy, Spain, and Switzerland, encompassing 150 fifth- and sixth-grade classrooms (Grima, et al., 2003). A mixed methodological construct examined primary students’ L1 performative skills and their attitudinal changes toward foreign languages in the five European countries. Findings showed that LA instructional methods positively impacted students’ attitudes toward foreign languages while it increased their desire to learn another language (Simard & Wong, 2004, p. 99). EVLang subsequently became an organization that branched into a new project called “*Janua Linguarum Reserta*” (2000-2003). The program currently involves ten countries, and researchers continue to conduct

investigate Language Awareness and disseminate practical information through an informative website.

Another European study examined attitudinal changes in primary-aged French students after their participation in an LA classroom (Young and Helot, 2003). The three-year project exposed students to different languages and cultures to promote positive attitudinal changes regarding language diversity. Young and Helot explained the underlying rationale as follows:

By legitimising languages we mean making them visible at school by allotting them a timetabled slot in the curriculum and implementing an inclusive language policy. This clearly signals official acceptance and approval by the establishment of all languages and cultures, regardless of their economic or literary value, to parents, teachers and children. (p. 242)

Findings showed that institutional changes positively impacted student attitudes towards multilingual/multicultural populations.

The practice of Language Awareness spread to bidialectal programs as well, especially where creoles and pidgins were spoken by minority populations (Siegel, 2002). One significant study that examined a bidialectal program took place in Cyprus, where the vernacular Cypriot dialect (CD) was spoken in the home and the Standard Modern Greek (SMG) was taught in academic domains (Yiakoumetti, Evans and Esch, 2005). These authors conducted a study to determine whether participants' attitudes toward the vernacular variety and fluency in the standard variety would improve after bidialectal instruction. The classroom treatment included a specially designed textbook that

contained sociolinguistic information about languages and dialects, “elements of the everyday lives of the students, from the Cypriot rather than the Greek reality” (p. 256), and practical exercises. Findings confirmed that students in both rural and urban locations markedly improved their Standard Modern Greek variety as they gained more positive attitudes toward both the prestigious and vernacular dialects. Moreover, the greatest gain was found among rural areas where vernacular Cypriot dialect was more prevalent. Such empirical evidence indicates that dialect awareness programs can positively impact students’ attitudes toward the vernacular variety spoken in the home environment as they develop fluency in the prestige dialect.

2.2 U.S. Political Context

Dialect awareness developed as an outcome of Language Awareness in Australia (Berry and Hudson, 1997), Canada (Coelho, 1998) and the United States (Alim, 2005), each program being shaped and formed by the socio-political circumstances of the place and time in which it was located. Specific to the United States was the tumultuous decade of the 60s, when social unrest precipitated the Civil Rights Movement. This political climate prompted a search for answers that would rectify the educational disparities between mainstream and minority ethnic groups. To understand the nodus that facilitated DA development, a brief chronological description of the social and political factors of this era is beneficial.

In 1954, the Supreme Court ruling in *Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education* determined school segregation to be unconstitutional. Disparate educational opportunities were evident, since up until this time segregated African-American schools had received

40% less funding than mainstream public schools (Lowe, 2004). Policy makers, educators, and community leaders reasoned that by desegregating schools, minority populations would have the same opportunity to achieve academic success, which in turn would lead to increased economic opportunities for these populations (Harris, Kamhi, & Pollock, 2000).

In addition to the blatant inequalities of a segregated system, prominent researchers began to look for the underlying reasons that caused Caucasian-Americans to obtain higher scores on standardized language exams than either African-American or Hispanic students. Researchers found that an inherent flaw existed in a school system where speakers of other languages and dialects were expected to produce standardized test scores comparable to those of monolingual English speakers (Rickford, 1998). This finding prompted educational policy changes that were intended to improve opportunities for students whose first language was not English. With the passing of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968 and subsequently the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974, school districts were required to find solutions to the discriminatory practices that deprived any student of an equal educational opportunity.

Researchers also began examining the possible impact that English dialects such as African American Vernacular English (AAVE) had on learning. Different hypotheses emerged, some of which suggested that “phonological and morphosyntactic differences between AAVE and Standard English (SE) contributed to lower reading scores” (Harris, Kamhi, Pollock, 2000, p. 157). Findings from Bartel & Axelrod (1973) and Wiederholt & Bryant (1992) indicated that although phonological differences did not appear to

interfere with SE, morphosyntactic differences could in fact contribute to lower reading test scores.

The issue of AAVE came to a head when, in 1996, the Oakland School District moved to integrate a bidialectal instructional approach into the curriculum. In naming AAVE a language variety, the school board requested federal funding to teach English as a prestige variety by contrasting it with AAVE (Thompson, 2002). This call set off the AAVE language controversy, as opponents claimed that AAVE proponents wanted to teach AAVE as a language variety. Newspaper articles and talk show hosts continued to debate the topic, challenging the underlying precept of bidialectism that suggested that students could learn a standard written English variety by using vernacular language in the classroom. In fact, Rev. Jesse Jackson, who first opposed the proposal, upon understanding it more fully stated, “They’re really asking for some resources,” Jackson said. “Just as you go from Spanish to English, go from improper grammar to English” (Cable News Network, 1996). Then, in 1997, the Linguistic Society of America (SLA) articulated a resolution that recognized AAVE as “systemic and rule-governed like all natural speech varieties”, supporting the Oakland School District in its decision (Rickford, 1998, p. 2).

In this way, dialect awareness took root in the United States, with an emphasis on teaching a prestige English variety by using AAVE as a starting point. The DA components were quite similar to the three primary objectives in European Language Awareness programs: (1) promoting acceptance of different language/dialect varieties, (2) studying texts of the less prestigious variety, and (3) recognizing through contrastive

analysis that all varieties are rule-governed. These became known as the “sociolinguistic, accommodation, and contrastive components” (Seigel, 2006, p. 13).

In response to the pressing social issues surrounding the Civil Rights Movement, critical language awareness (CLA) was also readily integrated into the curriculum. This facet expressly examined language ideologies and the “doctrine of appropriateness” in language development, maintenance, and usage (Seigel, 2006). Where prescriptivist instruction would deem grammatical forms to be correct or incorrect, the “doctrine of appropriateness” identified different rule-governed language usage to be appropriate or inappropriate according to the context and domain in which it was used. This subtle shift in pedagogical explanation created acceptance of a vernacular variety in certain domains, which in turn validated students’ use of language and their ethnolinguistic identity.

Thus, supporters promoted a bidialectal ideology where vernacular varieties could provide the base from which to construct a prestige language variety. Students explored language variation as it related to historical factors and issues of power (Alim, 2005). Instructional techniques promoted ethnographic exploration, contrastive linguistics exercises, and socio-political investigations, which were purported to connect students’ experiences with oral language production. In turn, technological advances promoted access to on-line programs, which developed into statewide curricula such as Wolfram’s (2007) dialect awareness program adopted by North Carolina (see http://www.ncsu.edu/lingistics/research_dialecteducation.php). These DA practices continue today to address the needs of bidialectal classrooms where non-standard language varieties exist. Empirical studies have documented how contrastive analysis in

particular has helped students who use vernacular English language varieties to acquire writing skills in mainstream American English (Fogel & Ehri, 2000). These studies have helped guide instructional practices and textbook development that pertain especially to a bidialect approach among African American speakers of AAVE (Crowell, Kolbar, Stewart, and Johnson, 1974; Feigenbaum, 1970; Wheeler and Swords, 2006). At the same time that the AAVE debate was occurring, proactive educators across the United States were assessing how to implement programs that would better meet the needs of bilingual students.

2.3 U.S. Spanish Research

Since the current study examines Spanish-English bilingualism in particular, this section of the study provides an overview of the various factors that have influenced the development of bidialectism in Spanish heritage language teaching. In the 1970s, the Chicano movement and the student-led Movimiento estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MECHA), a radical group born from this tumultuous era, gave voice to Chicano short fiction, prose, and poetry as a means of expressing barrio experiences. To provide ways to publish this new genre, the Chicano owned-and-operated publishing house, *Azteca*, was founded. Chicano literature gained voice and recognition through authors such as Rodolfo Anaya (1972), Rolando Hinojosa (1981), and Tomás Rivera (1987). Stigmatized vernacular language forms such as Caló and bilingual codeswitching, which used natural speech patterns spoken in barrio life, became a common trademark in Chicano literature (Callahan, 2001). Notable early literature that used such code alternation included *Down These Mean Streets* by Piri Thomas (1967), *Mi querido Rafa*,

by Hinojosa (1981), and *Puppet* by Cota-Cárdenas (1985). Consequently, Spanish-English codeswitching could be read for the first time in written form, which added both authenticity to the genre and increased interest in this typically oral code.

This decade also marked an upsurge of U.S. Spanish linguistic research especially in the maligned patterns of codeswitching (CS) (Lance, 1969; Lipski, 1977; Pfaff, 1979; Reyes, 1978; Timm, 1975). Many early investigations of codeswitching were based on a prescriptivist paradigm that intended to identify “errors” in the U.S. Spanish vernacular. For example, Lance (1969) conducted a descriptive analysis of U.S. Spanish syntactic structure with an analysis of sixteen codeswitching examples. His findings showed that Southwest Spanish included the suppression of syllables, the simplification of subjunctive mood, and the loss of lexical terms (p. 144). Although these findings have since been replicated in a more additive framework, the first studies of this kind carried a prescriptivist tone, suggesting that such vernacular speech should be eradicated rather than maintained. Consequently, early studies that differentiated U.S. Spanish from a prestige variety led to a Pygmalion-type strategy of correcting errors in the vernacular form.

Other research throughout this period attempted to find the development of universal rules that might explain CS phenomena (Pfaff, 1979; Poplack, 1982). In the case of Pfaff (1979), a quantitative examination of intrasentential codeswitching with a corpus of 200 speakers found that various lexical, structural, and social constraints did not require a new grammatical system; rather, Pfaff found that codeswitching relied upon an orderly process that utilized the grammars of both languages (p. 269). This

generalizable finding held promise for future comparative analysis between nonstandard and standardized varieties.

In the same time period, Sankoff and Poplack (1981) proposed the “morpheme equivalence constraint”, which stated that for code-switching to occur the “juxtaposition of L1 and L2 does not violate a surface syntactic rule of either language” (p. 581). This concept claimed that intrasentential codeswitching was a rule-governed phenomenon because it was constrained by morphosyntactic agreement at the grammatical point where switching occurred. Although subsequent studies refuted that this theory was universal in nature (MacSwan, 1999), its construct led to further research that examined codeswitching as a rule-governed phenomenon. In one empirical study, Poplack (1982), who researched speech patterns of twenty Puerto Rican bilinguals, found that although all bilingual respondents switched codes, the more fluent bilinguals used more intrasentential switches than less fluent bilingual speakers. This finding countered the prevailing belief that bilingual speakers used codeswitching for the sole reason that they had a linguistic deficiency. Studies such as these prompted a continued interest in codeswitching, and researchers continued to examine its linguistic structure as well as its communicative functions in bilingual communities.

Numerous linguistic aspects of bilingualism besides codeswitching gained popularity as research topics in the decades of the 70s and 80s. Lexicon was particularly popular for linguists as an area of study. For example, Blanch (1987) conducted a research project that compared lexical items of three cities, San Marcos, Mora, and Tucson. Blanch identified many Anglicisms, English borrowings, and morphosyntactic

changes that impacted U.S. Spanish. Other studies examined Spanish and English contact phenomena (Lipski, 1977; Mejías, 1980; Sobin, 1982) and special areas such as archaic word usage (Blanch, 1987). In addition, large lexical atlas projects were started that examined Spanish in the Southwest (Atwood, 1962). Other researchers continued to use such large language corpus to further analyze U.S. Spanish lexical items (Sawyer, 1964). For example, Sawyer, conducted a comparative lexical study in San Antonio, Texas from the Atlas Project initiated by Atwood. In his summary statements, Sawyer concluded:

Nothing that could be called a Mexican-American dialect of English was found in San Antonio, Texas. The English spoken by the bilingual informants was simply an imperfect state in the mastery of English. What does have significance is the fact that the relatively unskilled bilinguals...did not pass on their imperfect English to their children. (p. 78)

Sawyer's comment demonstrates the type of societal attitudes toward bilingual speech patterns that were prevalent during this era. It also indicates the relatively limited knowledge about bilingual cognitive processing of this time.

2.4 Bi-dialect Awareness as a Pedagogical Answer

With a growing body of linguistic evidence, researchers claimed that Spanish language learners had different learning and instructional needs than L2 learners. At the same time, sociolinguistic research and bilingual education began to promote the maintenance of the home language as an alternative to an assimilationist ideology. Thus, even though the 1980s was a time of anti-immigrant sentiment (Lipski, 2000), a

burgeoning movement was afoot to propel the agenda of language maintenance and bilingualism to the forefront. Researchers became advocates as they promoted research that would inform HL instructional practices (Roca, 1997; Valdés, Lozano & García-Moya, 1981). Valdés, Lozano & García-Moya (1981) explained as follows:

Teachers need to be made aware that heritage speakers are not simply imperfect speakers of Spanish who have fallen short of the monolingual norm. They are, rather, complex persons who are fundamentally different from monolinguals...members of speech communities in which a single language does not meet all their communicative needs. (p. 3)

Similarly, Kondo-Brown (2003) called for an examination of existing pedagogical practices and promoted the development of separate HL classes (p.12). In this climate, the bidialect strategy gained momentum as an instructional approach in Spanish heritage language. Thus, in the 1980s, bidialectalism was more readily recognized as an alternative to prescriptivist and subtractive pedagogical methodologies.

While empirical linguistic studies assisted pedagogues in determining which aspects of linguistic competence should be included in HL instruction, researchers also recognized the need for cohesive curriculum development and teaching strategies (Roca, 1997). Thus, in 1981, the first compendium of Spanish HL pedagogy articles was published in *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic Bilingual: Issues, Aims and Methods* by Valdés, Lozano, and García-Moya (1981). This volume helped to initiate the move toward a more additive teaching perspective.

Linguists continued to explore the “hierarchies of linguistic knowledge” (Potowski, 2002) to find which stigmatized variables were more salient in different speech communities (Beaudrie & Ducar, 2005; Benjamin, 1997). The tone of HL research changed, suggesting that a paradigmatic shift had occurred. Hidalgo (1993) is a good example of this shift since she advocated for a reappraisal of U.S. Spanish. Hidalgo stated, “changing the status of Spanish from a vernacular to a semi-official language will not only institutionalize it but will create the appropriate use domain that will guarantee its preservation” (p. 569). Hidalgo also suggested that input enhancement as had been identified in earlier dialect awareness studies could help Heritage Language learners acquire a standard language variety. In one empirical study, Hidalgo compared possible stigmatized phonological and morphosyntactic features of both Puerto Rican and Chicano Spanish to isolate problematic areas. Findings showed that “morphosyntactic characteristics that are expected to be stable” (p. 569) should be addressed since they pose the most noticeable distinction between vernacular and standard varieties. Other researchers followed suite, examining U.S. Spanish dialects to isolate the grammatical distinctions that stigmatized U.S. Spanish. Such studies found that U.S. Spanish contained simplification of the verbal systems (Potowski, 2002; Gutiérrez, 2003), used periphrastic rather than synthetic verb forms (Silva-Corvalán, 1996; Zabaleta, 2000), simplified the subjunctive (Zabaleta, 2000), and showed a shift in the use from ‘ser’ to ‘estar’ (Silva-Corvalán, 1994). Consequently, sufficient evidence from these and other studies isolated grammatical structures that could then be addressed in the HL classroom.

Educational articles were published, which although not identified as dialect awareness, supported the same precepts of DA found in language instruction to speakers of AAVE: (1) promoting acceptance of different language and dialect varieties, (2) studying texts of the less prestigious variety, and (3) recognizing through contrastive analysis that all varieties are rule-governed. Addressing the need for practical classroom application, researchers and educators started publishing digests geared toward practicing educators (Peyton, Lewelling & Winke, 2001). Some cited well-known critical pedagogue, Friere (1970), calling for the creation of praxis, the “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it” (p. 36). Students were encouraged to use ethnography of communication methods to connect language of their speech communities to formalized instruction (Peyton, Lewelling & Winke, 2001).

Empirical knowledge assisted textbook authors to determine which aspects of linguistic competence should be included in instructional material. Where previously HL textbooks had provided lengthy lists for error correction, many professionals found these to be counterproductive and prescriptive. Thus, textbook writers turned to contrastive analysis techniques to increase HL learners’ knowledge of the language from their own understanding of vernacular dialects. In line with these pedagogical developments, several current HL textbooks (Samaniego, Rodríguez, & Rojas, 2005; Roca, 2004; Valdés & Teschner, 2003) use examples of vernacular speech production to create a framework in which a more standardized variety of Spanish can be taught. In particular, Samaniego, Rodríguez, & Rojas (2005) employs specific grammatical explanations to clarify differences that occur between vernacular and academic speech varieties.

Finally, some researchers (Leeman, 2005; Martínez, 2003; Villa, 2009) have promoted Classroom Based Dialect Awareness (CBDA) through a critical theoretical perspective as a basis from which to discuss issues of power and prestige. As stated by Martínez (2003), “The fact that scholars are not writing about CBDA does not mean that it isn’t taking place in the heritage language classroom” (p. 5). One recently published example can be found in Trujillo (2009), who describes a learning community (LC) curricular approach used at Oregon State University for both HL and L2 students. Trujillo explains that content for this course is designed around a theme such as the one called “Fronteras, an examination of the physical, social, linguistic and psychological boundaries between socially constructed groups” (p. 380). In addition to learning the language in a thematically-based, student-centered classroom, students interact with the local bilingual community through service learning and civic engagement projects (p. 385). Trujillo shares examples of students’ poetry and writing that demonstrate the depth of student learning that have resulted from this learning approach. The composite of a themed content, speech community interaction, cultural events, and reflective practices evidenced in this example promote the ideological precepts found in critical pedagogy.

2.5 U.S. Spanish Language Attitudes

As noted in Section 1, ascribed identity can often negatively affect heritage language speakers’ self-perceptions of their avowed identity. When external stigma is attached to ways of speaking, individuals internalize these attitudes and believe they are true statements of their identity. With both ascribed and avowed patterns in mind, this

section will now review the current literature that pertains to attitudinal studies and ethnolinguistic identity.

Nero (2006) recognizes attitudinal influences as they relate to socioeconomic and political factors when speaking of Caribbean English. He explained as follows:

Within Caribbean communities, the question of linguistic identity is somewhat complex. While speech at the basilectal level is typically denigrated because of its association with low socio-economic status and lack of education, the basilect and especially the mesolect are often used to assert 'true' Caribbean identity in informal and private domains. Thus, there is a contradictory impulse of simultaneously denigrating and celebrating the vernacular, aptly characterized by Kachru and Nelson (2001) in comparing impulses elsewhere in the English-speaking world as 'attitudinal schizophrenia'. (p. 15)

According to Kachru and Nelson (2009), a diametric pull exists between a language variety that represents the perceived negatives of low socio-economic status and minimal education and the reality of a speech community that uses the same variety. Consequently, Caribbean English, intrinsically linked to Caribbean identity, exemplifies the negative influence that mainstream societal thought has upon the speech community's vernacular form.

Bilingual and multi-lingual communities commonly contend with similar diglossic situations where one language is held in high prestige (H) and the other is deemed low (L). Studies that examine language shift over time speak to these diglossic influences that impact a speech community and its choices of language use. For example, language

changes across generations provide insight into the societal status allotted a substrate language. A case in point is a study conducted by Rivera-Mills (2000), who examined language attitudes across generations. Fifty Hispanics of varying nationalities and diverse ages were interviewed to find attitudes toward language loyalty and language politics. The study found that loyalty toward Spanish diminished with passing generations. While second generation Hispanics still regarded Spanish highly, positive opinions about the language diminished in the third generation. In addition, Rivera-Mills found that language preferences vary across social strata, with less affluent respondents voicing a greater preference toward Spanish than their more affluent counterparts (Rivera-Mills, 2000). In this case, both generation and social stratification reflect the larger societal attitudes toward language assimilation, with subsequent generations assimilating into the U.S. mainstream society.

Montes-Alcalá (2000) also investigated attitudes regarding codeswitching in a Spanish-speaking population. Participants were audio-taped when narrating a fairy tale to capture their use of intersentential and intrasentential codeswitching. Montes-Alcalá hypothesized that those who had more positive attitudes toward codeswitching would produce more complex codeswitching in their narratives. However, findings showed that even those participants who had negative attitudes toward code mixing produced more complex forms than intersentential codeswitching forms (p. 226). The study also found that 60% of respondents held positive attitudes toward oral codeswitching and believed it reflected their identity. Montes Alcalá summarized that these young adult college students expressed more positive attitudes toward code switching than previous

generations did. This examination is particularly telling when considering language maintenance goals and the positive attitudinal shifts that can take place in heritage language populations.

Geographical location also affects language use and language attitudes. Ramírez (2000) conducted a comparative study of Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Mexican-American youth in six different cities to examine attitudes toward language use. The study examined respondents' perceptions of speaking Spanish and the attitudes toward language competence. Findings showed that attitudes varied both across geographical location and among national groups. For example, the Los Angeles population valued Spanish for economic and relational reasons more than populations from the other cities, regardless of their national origin. While the Mexican-American population believed Spanish helped them 'make more Hispanic friends' (67.3%), this relational perspective was noted less frequently in other locations even among the same national group. On the other hand, respondents in Miami cited Spanish as meeting their educational goals more frequently (42.6%) than in other cities. Ramírez summarizes that "the three Hispanic groups have different perceptions about the usefulness of Spanish for instrumental and integrative purposes" (p. 293). From Ramírez' findings, one can surmise that across different national groups and geographical locations, U.S. Spanish is valued as a communicative code. It has many different functions for bilingual speakers, and depending upon location, U.S. Spanish varieties are perceived quite favorably.

The varied attitudes toward speaking Spanish as a language in the United States as well as speaking a vernacular variety of the same language not only exemplify

categorical divisions such as generational or social-economic language perceptions, but they also indicate that identity and language are intimately intertwined and can be detailed more fully through narrative and interview techniques. As a result, some sociolinguists use qualitative analysis to examine the social construction of identity (Hidalgo, 2001, 2009). Mendoza-Denton (2006) terms this research construct “practice-based identity” (486). This view acknowledges that identity is constructed by interlocutors as they engage in activities and dialogue together. While Mendoza-Denton acknowledges that survey methods provide the means to objectively analyze “large-scale patterns” across different demographics, she also recognizes that practice-based identity examines the processes that generate linguistic variables (p. 488). Thus, this review will now turn to sociolinguistic studies that examine ethnolinguistic identity as a dynamic, ever-changing construct depending upon the interaction within social relationships.

Accommodation Theory (Gallois, Ogay, & Giles; 2005) helps to frame this discussion. According to accommodation theory, when people engage in communication, locutors tend to accommodate to each other’s ways of speaking. For bilingual speaking individuals, this is evidenced in linguistic features such as codeswitching. As expressed by Niño-Murcia and Rothman (2008), “switches can symbolically mark the identity we want to project at any given particular time within that particular group” (p. 17). For example, a bilingual speaker may slip into a vernacular speech style that contains code-switching and vernacular dialect when the domain calls for convergence, a move toward a similar speech style as the recipient of a conversation. Contrarily, a speaker may choose to not claim membership in a speech

community by purposefully diverging from the linguistic norms.

Niño-Murcia and Rothman (2008) provide examples by exploring ethnolinguistic identity in a longitudinal study of three multilingual brothers. This case study examines the brothers' multi-linguistic interaction as they construct relational identities across Spanish, Italian, and English. The boys identify language use according to whom they speak since each parent speaks a different language. Thus, they accommodate to the needs of the interlocutors to whom they speak. As reported by the authors, Italian is used with the boys' father, who is tri-lingual, but learned both English and Italian simultaneously in childhood. Spanish, on the other hand, is used when speaking with the boys' mother. Its use is limited to the roles in which it is spoken. Niño-Murcia and Rothman (2008) note, "Insofar as Catalana engenders the mother-figure, the compassionate strong-willed woman who simultaneously serves as the teacher, caregiver, and disciplinarian, the boys are most consistently exposed to Spanish that reflects these roles" (p. 320). The authors summarize that although the boys can choose from various codes, including code-switching among three languages, they consistently reciprocate with the language chosen by the interlocutor.

In another study, Bustamante-López (2009) records and analyzes 38 bilingual life histories. Young Mexican heritage adults describe different facets of being bilingual when language use and identity interact. Through narrative, they describe how English is used as a "currency of power, prestige and instruction." They describe firsthand how bilingual speakers use Spanish in certain domains, especially when with family. While these informants expressed pride associated with being bilingual, they were also

cognizant that linguistic forms such as code-switching could have negative connotations. Thus, its use was limited to certain domains and contexts. This linguistic identity indexed with code-switching was a specific lect where in-group members conversed among themselves. The study concludes that the bilingual speaker has not one but several identities, “three fluid linguistic identities exist: English, Spanish and code-switching in English and Spanish. In their narratives, participants configured their identities according to social practices and relationships. Social circumstances push them to assume these different identities” (p. 296).

As noted in Section 1, studies have reported that self-deprecating talk extends into the language classroom where students exhibit low self-esteem when they attempt to master grammatical structures and new lexicon. Evidence to this effect was found by Potowski (2002), who interviewed 25 students in a Spanish foreign language class. Respondents expressed feeling inferior to FL students because they were unfamiliar with grammatical content and more standard language varieties. Additional evidence appears in Coryell, Potowski, & Clark (2010), who found that circumstantial bilingual students enrolled in an online Spanish class had issues with their ethnic identity related to language production. In this context, the term circumstantial bilingual refers to HL learners whose language competency varies across different domains due to their life situations. These students were first interviewed individually. The researcher then compiled individual comments into a cultural fantasy theme by producing a representation of the ‘proper Tejana.’ Coryell found that the societal rhetoric created unrealistic expectations toward these students’ own language production. She states,

“the ‘proper Tejana’ knows she is to be true to her familial roots and to her family’s adopted country. She knows the traditions of Mexican and American culture. And she commands fluently the language of both countries while flawlessly negotiating the ins and outs of the unique entity of her bicultural/bilingual self” (p. 16). Being unable to live up to this ideal, these on-line students denigrated their own usage of “imperfect Spanish”, suggesting that its use “actually impedes the acquisition of ‘proper’ Spanish” (p. 23). In this case, such devaluing of the home language becomes a barrier to learning the heritage language. Subsequently, respondents take an online class rather than a face-to-face class to perfect their home language.

Other studies have attempted to identify sociolinguistic factors that positively impact heritage language learners. For example, Oh and Au (2005) surveyed and assessed fifty-five Latino participants. They found a strong correlation between cultural identification and cultural participation, as well as a relationship between cultural participation and High school and current Spanish use (p. 237). Oh and Au (2005) state:

The results of this study provide some preliminary evidence that encouraging HLLs to explore their cultural identification, to participate in cultural activities and to use the language in a variety of contexts outside of the classroom may help these language learners to successfully master the language”. (p. 239)

This finding clearly indicates the interface between ethnolinguistic identity and Heritage language development.

To reiterate the argument of the current study, it would follow that HL learners will more readily acquire an academic register if their social, professional and/or

personal aspirations revolve around its use. Exposure to an academic register is normally available in the classroom through professor modeling. However, development of an identity that positions HL speakers as prestige language users must also be available. In turn, accommodating to one's speech community and interlocutor's speaking style requires maintaining the vernacular variety while expanding into a new language form open to different functions and relationships, the academic dialect.

Consequently, it is suggested here that dialect awareness can promote positive ethnolinguistic identity while students develop a prestige language variety. Sociolinguistic content, covering linguistic variation, socio-political and cultural perspectives that underlie language choice, create connections between the community of practice and academic worlds, thus developing a communicative reason for perfecting the language. Studies have already shown that beginning students have a rich cultural heritage and latent exposure to Spanish through community and family, even though they may minimally practice the language (Beaudrie and Ducar, 2005). When the connection between community and classroom are created in the academic environment, a more positive attitude results, prompting the desire to learn the Spanish language relevant to the real world.

2.6 Discourse Analysis

The last section of this literature review will examine classroom observation and discourse analysis as a methodological framework for this study. Dirr (2004) reports that classroom observation is an effective research tool for gathering and analyzing classroom data, particularly for classrooms where a pedagogical treatment has been

employed. Through observing the classroom environment and taping student-teacher discourse, the researcher has a means of capturing classroom conversation and of subsequently analyzing the implementation of pedagogical practices.

Christie (2005) clarifies that the classroom provides both structured experience and social practice, and both are reflected in classroom talk. Discourse analysis provides a way to analyze the functional patterns and social phenomena that occur when students and instructor engage in a learning environment (Thornbury & Slade, 2006).

Researchers (Long and Sato, 1983; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Tharp and Gallimore, 1988) have isolated interactive functions such as eliciting information, informing, and evaluating, which explain the underlying structure to classroom conversation.

For example Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) searched for a ‘grammar of interaction’ through a functional perspective. They found that teachers often used a pattern they termed the Initiation, Response, Feedback (IRF) in the classroom. This instructional discourse did not mimic natural speech patterns. Rather, the teacher spent most instructional time asking display questions rather than eliciting new information. Long and Sato (1983) found that display questions outranked referential questions seven to one. Thus, communicative practice opportunities for students decreased as teacher-centered display questions increased.

In line with the IRF instructional pattern, Tharp and Gallimore (1988) address classroom discourse as containing a specific type of conversation that they term ‘instructional’. They state,

The concept [of instructional conversations]...contains a paradox: ‘Instruction’

and ‘conversation’ appear contrary, the one employing authority and planning, the other equality and responsiveness. The task of teaching is to resolve this paradox. To most truly teach, one must converse; to truly converse is to teach. (p. 111)

When placing emphasis on bilingual language learning and identity as this study does, it would follow that classroom conversation necessitates a threefold plan: (1) modeling a standard Spanish dialect; (2) creating a student-teacher and student-student conversational tone that encompasses content relevant to students’ ethnolinguistic backgrounds; and (3) providing opportunities for students to engage in increasingly complex conversational patterns of their own while maintaining relevance through course content.

If language instruction employs communicative processes whereby students have the opportunity to practice and perfect new language patterns and where social meaning can be co-constructed within different frameworks of social understanding, I hypothesize that students will attain a broader Spanish language repertoire. For example, if the IRF pattern decreases and discursive dialogue increases between students and instructor, two things may happen. First, students should become engaged in the learning process through a conversational mode, lowering the affective filter (Krashen, 1981), thus reducing the anxiety and stress related to learning a prestige language variety. An intrinsic motivation to learn may be increased since classroom conversation pertains to students’ experiences, including their future goals and aspirations. Moreover, students may recognize that the heritage language development they have experienced thus far is

pertinent and valid in building a broad Spanish language repertoire. Students should in turn demonstrate a desire to learn and use the prestige variety to their advantage.

To examine this concept more fully, one can turn to van Lier (1996) who discusses the concept of “handover.” Van Lier explains that for discourse to be more conversational, whether it is between students or student and teacher, it must be symmetrical. He states, “the achievement of mutual understanding, contingency and intersubjectivity is dependent on the skillful use of all relevant social and linguistic resources...” (p. 173). Thus, van Lier proposes that classroom talk can have “an orientation toward interactional symmetry” (p. 169), which is signaled through different devices. Van Lier divides the “social and linguistic sources” that comprise symmetry into three categories. He explains that these are: “proactive (planning, predicting), concurrent (making signals during one’s one or another person’s turn) and reactive (summarizing, rephrasing and wrapping up). If these conversational tools are integral to utterances, the interaction becomes more equilateral and symmetrical. Evidence to this effect includes “empathy markers (“Wow!”), repetitions of parts of each other’s utterances (“two bedroom – two bedroom”), intonation patterns, gestures, and so on” (p. 171).

This ‘interactional symmetry’ should become apparent in the classroom discourse as students and instructor simultaneously engage in structured experience and social practice. As students become more proficient in the target language, the instructional conversation can eventually transform from the teacher-centered IRF format to one more discursive in nature, which will help students to scaffold their

existing knowledge, listen to language modeling within a conversational context, and learn to produce a more complex language structure.

Consequently, I examine the classroom discourse to analyze the IRF patterns and examples of ‘handover’, when teacher talk transforms into a more complex conversational pattern. Discourse analysis will be used to examine the interactive discourse that occurs when dialect awareness exercises are used in the treatment class. Conversations will be analyzed for “handover”, whether students actively take on the challenge to generate academic discourse from a classroom discourse that encourages symmetry and equality.

3. METHODOLOGY

In this study, I applied a multi-method approach to examine dialect awareness as a classroom-based treatment in the course entitled, *Problems in Spanish Language Teaching*. The mixed-methods design includes a survey instrument with which I document changes in student attitudes toward language use. I also examine dialect awareness in the heritage language classroom as a discursive practice by using discourse analysis. Precedence for using mixed-methods has been set by previous classroom-based research, exemplifying the need to examine instructional practices from different perspectives to develop a comprehensive understanding of the dynamic interactive experience that teaching and learning affords. Supporting this perspective, Nunan (2005) notes that in recent years researchers have expanded the variety of methods used in classroom-based research, even crossing quantitative and qualitative paradigms to examine “the complexities of classroom events” (p. 237). Different studies exemplify a variety of mixed-method applications. For example, Romero, M. (2000) uses classroom observation, student group interviews, and a teacher interview to analyze classroom practices for HL learners. Lacorte & Canabal (2005) applies questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observation to examine instructors’ perceptions of Spanish classrooms. In her dissertation, Martin-Beltrán (2006) collected data of minority and majority language students through recorded transcriptions and field notes. I follow in this tradition to elucidate student reactions to dialect awareness as an instructional practice.

Section three describes the data collection and data analysis techniques. In section one, I explain my rationale for selecting *Problems in Spanish Language*

Teaching as the focus of my study. Section two includes an explanation of the data collection procedures. Section three contains a description of the six specific exercises that the instructor used as DA treatment. In section four, I describe the pre- and post-survey instruments that were used to capture student attitudes toward language use and toward their dialect awareness classroom experiences. In section five, I explain the multiple methods used to examine the breadth of data captured through the survey instrument, classroom observations, and focus group interviews. Finally, section six includes a descriptive overview of the convenience sample, including demographic information and a descriptive account of HL students' self-reported language use and language attitudes. Two research questions were examined:

Research Question #1: RQ 1: Does dialect awareness increase HL student confidence in learning a prestige language variety?

Research Question #2: RQ 2: Does dialect awareness treatment impact student attitudes toward Spanish vernacular varieties?

3.1 Course Selection

Two factors prompted me to examine the course entitled, *Problems in Spanish Language Teaching*. First, I knew that the course was taught by a professor who valued dialect awareness as an instructional practice. The professor had already applied dialect awareness when teaching Spanish Heritage Language learners and was willing to add specific exercises that were DA content. Second, the class consisted of pre-service teachers who would soon be part of the educational workforce. Since they had the potential of impacting many future bilingual students, I felt it was important to examine

their attitudes toward Spanish language varieties and toward the bidialectal instructional approach.

Three classes participated from 2007 to 2009, and all classes were taught by the same professor. Forty-nine Spanish language students participated in the study. The majority of the students had self-identified as either pre-service Spanish or bilingual teachers in training.

3.2 Data Collection Procedures

Data was collected for this classroom-based study through various means. These included a pre-post survey instrument, field notes documenting 30-hours of classroom observations, and audio recordings of focus group interviews. Data was also collected through formative assessment documents, which included homework and reflective writing assignments. As recognized by Lindlof and Taylor (2002), multiple sources of collecting data and the use of multiple methods to analyze this data provide a way to triangulate the findings for accuracy and credibility. Discussion of the triangulated findings will be covered in Section 4.

At the beginning of each semester study participants answered the on-line pre-survey instrument in a computer lab reserved exclusively for this purpose. Students gave written consent for classes to be observed and audio-taped; however, they were not informed of the study's purpose and intent beyond recognizing that the research was for a doctoral dissertation. Students proceeded to take their course for one semester. Once they completed this coursework, they responded to the post-survey, again in a reserved computer lab.

During the classroom observations, I remained as unobtrusive as possible, each time sitting close to the door. My presence appeared to have little effect on the classroom dynamics since students and instructor freely engaged in discussions, showing comfortable body language and participatory classroom discourse. Data collection procedures included taking field notes and audiotaping the sessions. The classroom notes, which were typed on a laptop, included descriptions of classroom activities, notations regarding instructor and student interactions, sections of verbatim dialogue, and comments regarding student engagement. After each classroom session, I re-read and highlighted portions of these notes that applied to DA themes, paying special attention to the discourse and social interactions that had occurred. The dialogues that contained dialect awareness treatment exercises were then transcribed and stored in Microsoft Word files along with the chronologically ordered classroom field notes.

To complement the data obtained through the survey instrument and classroom observations, I also compiled data from three focus group interviews. Each group contained from four to six individuals, and each was formed toward the end of the semester when students had become familiar with my presence and had gained a positive rapport with me. The interviews were audio-recorded after the participants had been guaranteed confidentiality. I used a flexible set of questions that first elicited language background and language use information. Once respondents had reached a comfortable conversational style, they were asked to discuss the course content, particular content that had been challenging, rewarding, and/or useful to their personal language development and future roles as teachers. Finally, students discussed the dialect

awareness exercises and instructional methods used by the professor. The analysis format and results will be discussed in Section 6.

3.3 Dialect Awareness Treatment Exercises

Six dialect-awareness exercises were introduced into the DA treatment class. Five exercises were derived from existing heritage language textbooks. One was the creation of the DA professor. A brief description of each is included below.

The first exercise set was excerpted from Chapter 8 of *Lingüística Aplicada: Adquisición del español como segunda lengua* by Koike and Klee (2003). This chapter entitled “Lengua y sociedad en el mundo hispanohablante,” covers an overview of sociolinguistic factors that impact Spanish and regional dialects. Particular emphasis is placed on the characteristics of U.S. Spanish and bilingual speech phenomena. It is of value to look at one of these question sets to examine their application in HL classrooms. One particular set reads:

1. ¿Por qué existen diferencias dialectales? ¿A qué se deben? ¿Cuáles son algunas de las posibles causas? Identifique algunas de las variedades de inglés y español. ¿Cuáles son algunas de las características de dichas variedades? [Why do different dialects exist? To what can they be attributed? What are some possible causes? Identify some of the varieties of English and Spanish. What are some of the characteristics of these varieties?]
2. ¿Por qué se ven estigmatizados algunos dialectos? Dé ejemplos de tales dialectos. [Why are some dialects stigmatized? Give some examples of these dialects.]

3. ¿Conoce Ud. algunas diferencias regionales del español? ¿A qué nivel lingüístico se presentan: fonológico, morfológico, sintáctico, léxico, pragmático, no-verbal? Dé algunos ejemplos específicos. Trate de incluir no sólo ejemplos léxicos sino diferencias en por lo menos uno de los demás niveles. [Do you know some regional differences in Spanish? Where are they apparent in the phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, pragmatics and non-verbal communication? Give some specific examples. Try to include not only lexical examples but differences from at least one other linguistic category.]
4. ¿A qué comunidad(es) de habla pertenece Ud.? ¿Cómo sabe Ud. que se tratan de comunidades de habla? [To what speech communities do you belong? How do you know that these ways of talking pertain to speech communities?]. (p. 164)

Both cognitive and affective learning devices are present in the Koike and Klee question set. The exercise uses cognitive objectives of knowledge, comprehension, and application (Bloom, 1956). For example, the questions ask students to apply their bilingual knowledge to the task, whether this has been learned from academic instruction or practical experience. The chapter gives students a meta-framework in which to discuss these experiences with newly-learned linguistic vocabulary. In the treatment classes, students read Capítulo 8, *Lengua y sociedad en el mundo hispanohablante* and answered the question sets after each section. They then discussed their responses in a dialogic classroom environment, reflecting upon their own metalinguistic language use as Spanish speakers.

The next set of exercises was taken from *Nuevos Mundos* (2004) by Ana Roca.

The textbook includes U.S. Spanish dialects common to different Hispanic ethnicities. Chapters are divided into ethnic groupings such as Mexican-American, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. Chapter Two (pp. 39-71), entitled “Los mexicanos,” presents excerpts of writing from Rosaura Sánchez, Jorge Ramos, Abelardo Delgado, and Richard Rodríguez. The chapter also mentions famous Chicanos such as César Chávez, Edward James Olmos, Jaime Escalante and Guadalupe Valdés, and it provides a bibliography that includes Mexican-American literature, movies, publishing companies and websites. The book comes accompanied with a workbook, which details commonly found distinctions between U.S. Spanish dialects and standard Spanish, offering students a comparison and contrast format by which to learn the standard variety. Students in the DA treatment groups completed three of these workbook exercises, which contained analyses of false cognates, lexical borrowings, and loan translations (pp. 53-58).

Next, a short story from Sánchez (2003) was applied in the classroom. *Cartas a Rosa* is found in the Spanish textbook, *Sorpresas* (pp. 135-146). Four different letters to a woman named Rosa describe a shooting that occurred in an Austin neighborhood. The letters are written in different styles by speakers from different socio-cultural perspectives who observed the incident. The chapter ends with vocabulary building exercises as well as comprehension and opinion questions that prompt students to engage in a contrastive analysis of standard and non-standard forms.

Students first read the letters and completed the exercises prior to class. They were instructed to be prepared to discuss the uses of non-standard speech varieties depicted in the letters in class. The students and professor then reviewed the letters for

both content and style. Students were encouraged to discuss their perceptions of the different voices projected through the letters. They then discussed specific grammatical usage found in the letters and discussed their own use of these or similar structures.

The fourth exercise is called “The F Code” or “Hablar en F” as mentioned by Martínez (2003). This coded language game adds the letter ‘f’ and a vowel between each syllable, disguising the words to create a ‘coded’ message. The game is often played in Mexico when parents disguise language so children cannot understand them. An example found on a blog demonstrates its structure, “Puesfe yofo sofolofo sefe quefe sefe llafamafa afasífi” (pues yo solo sé que se llama así) (<http://forum.wordreference.com/showthread.php?t=44391>). The professor first used the “F Code” in a classroom to simulate second language learners’ experience of listening to and deciphering an L2. Prior to class, the professor selected a student who knew how to speak the “F code,” asking her to help with the exercise. In class, the professor and the selected student began a seemingly spontaneous conversation as other students listened. When the conversation came to a close, the professor asked students to describe their immediate reactions to the experience. Had they understood the conversation? How had they felt while it was occurring? What were their reactions to this ‘new code’? Could anything be learned from this experience? If so, what? Students discussed these questions in small groups and rejoined the larger classroom group to share their responses in a dialogic exchange. After class, they continued the conversation on the multi-media Angel discussion board. This online course management system was used as an extension of the traditional classroom. Students communicated among themselves

and with their professor after class through chats, discussion boards and e-mails.

The fifth exercise, adapted from Martínez (2003) is called “Apodos.” It deals with power and prestige in language production by examining how nicknames relate to social power. As explained by Martínez (2003), “People use language in order to exert power. When we engage in the jest of assigning apodos, we are implicitly expressing a greater degree of social power. When the apodo sticks, our power becomes legitimized and ratified by those who continue to use the apodo” (p. 11). In this regard, Luke (2005) states:

We can think of the critical, then, in at least two ways – as an intellectual, deconstructive, textual, and cognitive analytic task and as a form of embodied political anger, alienation, and alterity. In both senses, it entails an epistemological Othering and “doubling” of the world – a sense of being beside oneself or outside of oneself in another epistemological, discourse, and political space than one typically would inhabit. (p. 26)

In line with this quote, this exercise is expected to open opportunities for students to explore the “other” from a critical perspective. As stated by Martínez, “The apodo activity is useful inasmuch as it highlights the underlying motivations that sustain and reproduce the evaluative differentiation of linguistic forms” (p. 13). Students were first asked to process this concept through identifying their own nicknames ascribed to them by others. They then proceeded to give their classmates nicknames. An exploration of power and language ensued as students were asked to also create a nickname for their professor. Martínez suggests this may prove to be difficult due to the student-teacher

power dynamic involved. Data from this exercise included open and closed-ended survey responses and recorded classroom discourse.

The sixth and final exercise is a study in styles and registers created by the dialect awareness professor and based on Chapter 8 of *Variación lingüística* from Azevedo (1992). The chapter outlines five distinct registers on a continuum from informal to formal. Students are asked to distinguish between formal, informal, and intimate registers. The exercise consists of sentences in the formal, neutral or informal language style. An example follows:

Formal: ¿Cómo lo sabe usted? [How do you know?]

Neutral: A los mexicanos les encanta el fútbol. [Mexicans love soccer.]

Informal: Ella es bien agarrada con la feria. [She is such a tightwad.]

The exercise concludes with a group discussion in which students reflect upon their responses and discuss style usage according to domain and context. Analysis methods applied to all data sets will be explained in section 3.5.

3.4 Pre-Post Survey Instruments

Both a pre-survey and a post-survey instrument created on Survey Monkey were utilized to gather data concerning the dialect awareness treatment. The two instruments served to gather general background information as well as attitudinal information. Both the pre- and post-instruments were first piloted in a class that contained dialect awareness instruction. Twenty-nine participants responded to the pilot test. Minor revisions were made to the instruments based upon this test.

3.4.1 Pre-Survey Instrument

The pre-survey, which is divided into three sections, was designed to collect both descriptive and attitudinal information. Students responded by answering “strongly agree”, “agree”, “neither agree nor disagree”, “disagree”, or “strongly disagree”. For analytical purposes, student responses were assigned numerical values. Five (5) denoted “strongly agree” while one (1) denoted “strongly disagree.” The first ten questions to the pre-survey ascertain demographic and language use information. This section includes inquiry into factors that contribute to language maintenance such as proximity to the border, familial and relational contact, and language of schooling. It also includes questions that pertain to language use. Respondents are asked to identify in which domains they tend to use English, Spanish, and/or mixed code. Answers to these questions are included in the description of the sample.

The second section of the pre-survey, questions 11-30, collects attitudinal information toward language use. Questions include attitudes toward language varieties and self-reported levels of confidence in acquiring a standard language variety.

Section three (questions 31-106) includes two sets of recorded dyadic conversations for an exploratory examination of language use across formal and informal domains. The first conversation set takes place at a university financial aid office where a student requests information about a summer loan. The second depicts two teenagers discussing the purchase of clothes at a local mall. As such, the first conversation set is a more formal domain than the second; yet, each is a familiar setting to the respondents. Each conversation set includes a version spoken in (1) formal

Spanish, (2) semi-formal Spanish, (3) informal vernacular Spanish using code switching, (4) semi-formal English and (5) formal English. All conversations were scripted by the researcher and checked for authenticity by native speakers, including U.S. Spanish Border dialect speakers. To provide further credibility to the spoken language style, student volunteers accustomed to speaking in U.S. Border Spanish dialect were selected to record the vernacular conversations. The same speakers were used to record one conversation set with different levels of formality in order to avoid paralinguistic factors (ex. tone, pitch, stress) that might skew responses.

Participants were asked to rate the conversations according to what language code they deemed appropriate for the domain in which it was used. They were also asked to indicate which conversation would be more typical of their speaking style in this setting. This exploratory information was employed in tandem with the attitudinal data to determine what respondents consider to be appropriate language use in the U.S./Mexico border region's different domains (see survey in Appendix A).

3.4.2 Post-Survey Instrument

The post-survey asked respondents the same attitudinal questions found in the pre-survey (questions 10 – 30) to determine whether self-perceptions of language skills and language use changed during the semester. A new section of questions that pertained to the DA treatment (questions 4-9) examined student attitudes toward the particular exercises described in Section 3.2. Respondents were asked which DA treatment topics and exercises were used in class. They were then asked to rate the classroom treatments according to the five-point Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly

disagree) used in the pre-survey instrument. Open-ended questions allowed students to add commentaries regarding the selected topics and instructional applications (See Appendix A).

3.5 Methods of Analysis

Data was analyzed with both quantitative and qualitative methods. The survey instruments were submitted to several Chi-square and Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric analysis through SPSS. Pre-post survey responses were analyzed for (a) confidence level in Spanish skills and (b) attitudes toward U.S. Border Spanish prior to and after one semester of instruction. The Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric test was selected for analysis purposes because the sample size is small and the Kruskal-Wallis test can be used with low frequency data. Pre-post responses for the treatment were first analyzed separately.

Qualitative data included field notes, audio-taped classroom discourse, audio-taped focus group conversations, open-ended survey responses, and classroom assignments. This large volume of collected data was managed by focusing on the DA treatment exercises. I categorized, sorted, and indexed in Microsoft Word files any of the data that pertained to one of the six exercises. This means that data reduction was employed to prioritize which content would be used in the analysis (Linkdlof & Taylor, 2002).

After numerous sessions of close readings, I further codified the extensive material through an inductive approach, “chunking” content into categories. When reoccurring words and phrases were used repeatedly in the data, I made comments to this effect. For example, I paid particular attention to the single-word synonyms and

multiple-word phrases with similar meanings. Through this inductive process, themes were identified and named, which ultimately helped to devise a codebook (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). When patterns emerged in this process, I took note of the most salient commonalities to develop the analysis.

For example, in analyzing the responses to the Koike and Klee exercise, I found that two groups of respondents existed: (1) those who spoke a Standard Spanish and had a broad Spanish repertoire, and (2) HL students whose primary communicative code was a non-standard Spanish variety. This pattern was also evident through observing classroom dynamics. After a careful analysis of the responses, it became apparent that students responded differently depending upon their place of birth. Group A in this case was comprised of fluent Spanish speakers born primarily on the Mexican side of the border. Group B represents students who resided primarily on the U.S. side of the border their entire lives. Although not all classroom discourse could be so easily categorized along binary terms, discussion of the Koike exercise could clearly be explained through this codification. When patterns of this type arose in the data, they were codified and have been reported as an integral part of the analysis in Section 4.

3.6 Population Description

The ensuing examination describes the study sample to provide a snapshot of the demographics in this U.S./Mexico border region's student population. It also establishes self-identified use of Spanish in both private and public domains. This description sets the stage to understanding the language and cultural dynamics that occurred in the language classroom.

3.6.1 Birthplace

The majority of respondents were U.S. citizens and 65% (n=30) identified Texas as their birthplace. As can be seen on Table 1, another 37% were born in Mexico.

Table 1: *Place of birth*

	Number	Percent
Texas	30	61
Other U.S states	1	2
Mexico	18	37
Total	49	100%

3.6.2 Age of Respondents

As Table 2 shows, over half of the population (53%) was between the ages of 21 to 25 although a fairly large percentage (28.5%) was also over the age of thirty.

Table 2: *Age of respondents*

	Number	Percent
18-20	1	2
21-25	26	53.1
26-30	8	16.3
31-40	10	20.4
41-50	3	6.1
+50	1	2
Total	49	100

3.6.3 Gender

Ninety-four percent of respondents were female (see Table 3). Coupled with age, these figures indicate that many respondents were returning adult females who wanted to become teachers.

Table 3: *Gender of respondents*

	Number	Percent
Male	3	6
Female	46	94
Total	49	100%

3.6.4 Ethnic Identity

Respondents primarily identified themselves with the terms Mexican-American and Hispanic to connote ethnic identity, many using both terms interchangeably. In fact, over 20% of the respondents chose to select both Mexican-American and Hispanic ethnic identifiers, which clarifies why the totals in Table 4 are higher than 100% (see Table 4).

Table 4: *Ethnic terms*

	Number	Percent
Mexican-American	22	44.9
Mexican	12	24.5
Latino/a	3	6.1
Tejano/a	1	2.0
Hispanic	21	42.9
Chicano/a	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	49	120.4%

When asked to explain what these terms meant, respondents repeatedly referred to birthplace, culture, and language, although subtle differences appeared when examining the terms' connotations. For example, the term "Mexican-American" consistently referred to birthplace and mixed ancestry. As stated by one respondent, "Mexican-

American means to me that I am of Mexican descent but am and was born American.”

Forty-six percent (n=10) of those who used the term Mexican-American referred to birthplace, as exemplified in this quote; “I was born and raised in the U.S. but my parents and ancestors were born and raised in Mexico.” For some it meant being born in Mexico but raised in the United States; “I was born in Mexico, but I’m naturalized as an American citizen.” Another respondent that termed her ethnicity as Mexican-American stated, “even though I was born in Mexico, I have spent an important amount of time in the U.S. to consider it home.” To some, this term meant blended parental ties: “It means that I have adopted the Mexican and American type of living because my Mom is from Mexico and my dad is from the United States.” These direct quotes describe similar yet distinct connotations underlying the ethnic term.

In contrast, the term Hispanic connoted cultural ties more often than other ethnic identifiers. Forty-one percent (n=8) of those who self-identified with this term mentioned its connection to culture. As one respondent stated, “Hispanic means my heritage, my culture, my traditions.” This descriptor often reflected positive overtones, as expressed by this respondent; “I like where I am from and all our traditions.” In fact, none of the responses using the term “Hispanic” indicated negative connotations.

Heritage language clearly indexed ethnicity. Respondents spoke of language and culture in one breath, describing when they used Spanish language varieties in specific contexts and domains to create relationships, accommodate to others’ speech forms, negotiate language use, and ‘fit in’ to a preferred speech community. When discussing the construction of identity through language, both the ethnic terms, Mexican-American and

Hispanic, were used interchangeably. One respondent stated, “It means I speak two languages, Spanish and English. For example at home it’s mostly Spanish and at the school English.” Another said, “[Hispanic] means that I can fall into a larger group of people that have different races but have one or more common threads, like language.”

In contrast to the duplicity of connotations that the terms Mexican-American and Hispanic held, the word “Mexican” explicitly meant birthplace, oftentimes distinguishing one’s citizenship. One respondent said, “being born in Mexico makes me a Mexican, and even though I have been living in the U.S. for a very long time, I don’t consider me anything else.” Mexican nationals who did not use this term preferred to use either “Mexican-American” or “Hispanic” instead.

None of the terms had political connotations for respondents, and none of the respondents chose to call themselves Chicanos. A few (6.1%) selected Latino/a as an ethnic category. Yet, for most who marked Latino/o as an ethnic term, little distinction existed between this and other terms. Rather, this word connoted similar definitions simultaneously referred to the words Hispanic, Mexican, and Mexican-American, reflecting the homogenous Mexican roots of this border population.

Finally, the term Tejano/a was fraught with negative connotations for 2% of the population. These respondents discussed their insecurity in speaking either English or Spanish outside of the border region. They stated that their common code was U.S. Border Spanish, including the variables of code-switching, Anglicisms, and calques.

3.6.5 First Language

As noted in Table 5, 59.1% (n=29) identified Spanish as their first language. Respondents frequently commented as in this example: “Yo naci en Laredo, Texas y toda mi vida e [*sic*] vivido aquí. Mis dos padres son de Laredo, Texas también y lo único que hablamos en casa es español.” [I was born in Laredo, Texas and all my life I’ve lived here. Both my parents are from Laredo, Texas and we only speak Spanish at home.] Another 28.6% (n=14) said they acquired both languages simultaneously as young children. Consequently, 87.7% (n=43) of the study’s population had come into contact with Spanish at an early age. This compares to 40.8% (n=19) of the population that had acquired English at an early age.

Table 5: *First language*

	Number	Percent
English	6	12.2
Spanish	29	59.1
Both	14	28.6
Total	49	100%

3.6.6 Generation and Language Choice

Respondents were asked to identify to whom they speak either or both languages, and which language variety is most commonly used in different contexts and domains. As

visible in Table 6, 91.8% (n=45) of respondents identified Spanish as the language spoken most with grandparents. None indicated they spoke English with their grandparents.

Table 6: *Languages spoken with grandparents*

	Number	Percent
Spanish	45	91.8
English	0	0
Both	0	0
Not Applicable	2	4.1
No response	2	4.1
Total	49	100%

Spanish continued to dominate parent-child relationships although fewer respondents reported speaking only Spanish with a parent than with a grandparent (see Table 7). Seventy-seven percent (n=38) stated they spoke Spanish with their mothers and 68% (n=33) spoke primarily Spanish with their fathers. Another 21% (n=10) spoke both languages with their fathers. Only 4% of respondents spoke exclusively English with either parent.

Table 7: *Languages spoken with parents*

	Father		Mother	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Spanish	33	68	38	77
English	2	4	2	4
Both	10	21	9	19
Not Applicable	4	7	0	0
Total	49	100%	49	100%

As noted in Table 8, respondents continued to speak Spanish with siblings but to a lesser degree than with parents. Rather, both languages became a prominent means of communication among siblings. Clearly, the majority of respondents (60%) chose to use both languages in sibling relationships and with friends (50%). Some respondents mentioned that they used mixed code while others indicated they used either language separately. Although English also took a more prominent role when respondents spoke with friends (25%) than with siblings (12.5%), again, both languages continued to be used by the majority of respondents. This decrease in Spanish use can presumably be attributed to more diverse peer interactions, which would include contact with monolingual English speakers or less fluent Spanish speakers. It could also be indicative of the increasing dominance of English at school and a diglossic relationship between Spanish and English in public domains.

Table 8: *Languages spoken with siblings and friends*

	Siblings		Friends	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Spanish	11	22	11	23
English	6	12	12	25
Both	29	60	26	52
Not Applicable	3	6	0	0
Total	49	100%	49	100%

3.6.7 Languages of Education

The term ‘generation’ became increasingly difficult to define according to the standard definitions used by the U.S. Census, which makes categorical divisions as follows:

1st generation: foreign-born children of foreign-born immigrants.

2nd generation: U.S.-born children with at least one parent born outside of the U.S.

3rd generation and above: U.S.-born children of U.S.-born parents.

(Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008, p. 2)

At the U.S.-Mexico border, birthplace does not easily explain the term “generation” or the language and educational experiences that are attached to this term.

As noted in Table 1, 61% of the study’s population was born in Texas, which according to

U.S. Census terms would categorize them as 2nd or 3rd generation and above. Yet some individuals in this study had been born in the United States but lived in Mexico. Others who were foreign born lived in the U.S. while their parents held U.S. citizenship. Different “generations” even existed within families, with siblings having been born in different countries.

The complexity in defining generation reflected another aspect of living in the borderland often known as ‘transborder crossing’. Martínez (1994) clarifies that transborder crossers depend upon both sides of the border for social, economic, and familial ties. Noted in the current study, educational motivations also prompt border-crossing. Some students cross the border daily to study at the University while others relocate to the U.S. when they become students. In fact, the majority of respondents who lived in Mexico at the time of this study, regardless of their birthplace, exemplified the trans-border crosser experience. In private conversations and through focus group discussions, students indicated they had lived and studied for a period of their lives in both countries. Individual experiences did not fit one particular pattern since some respondents had come to the U.S. at an early age with their parents. Others had traversed the border to study at local U.S. high schools. Still others had moved to Mexico to “learn Spanish” after having finished part of their schooling in the United States. Consequently, this dynamic border-crossing movement is particularly acute in terms of educational experiences. Students who traverse the border become a product of both the U.S. and Mexico school systems. This population, often referred to in English as Second Language (ESL) circles as the 1.5 generation, will be identified herein as ‘transborder crossers’.

To some extent, the bilingual community of Laredo, Texas reflects diglossic language use as defined by Fishman (1967), where two different languages represent High (H) and Low (L) varieties. In this case English, typically acquired in school, would be considered the H variety while Spanish, learned in the home, would be considered the L variety. However, as evidenced in survey responses, the divisions between English and Spanish in this bilingual city are not so simply defined. Rather, both languages extend across public domains in varying degrees. To understand this phenomenon, language usage will first be examined in the educational arena and will then be explored in other public domains.

Over half of the respondents began their pre-kinder education in Spanish; yet, English instruction soon took precedence and increased in the formative years. By grades seven and eight, 68.1% (n=32) of the population was taught in English only (see Table 9).

Table 9: *Language of education*

Grade Level	Spanish	English	Spanish and English	Other	Response
Pre-kinder	58.1	20.9	16.3	4.7	43
K-3	39.1	37	30.4	2.2	46
4-6	19.1	57.4	29.8	0	47
7-8	14.9	68.1	19.1	0	47
9-12	8.9	62.2	40	0	45

However, 40% responded that they received instruction in both Spanish and English in their high school years. This increase suggests that some respondents counted the two-year foreign language requirement as Spanish language instruction. Most high school students who plan to enter a university study under the Texas Education Code 74.61 (State of Texas Recommended High School Program, 2010). The Recommended Plan requires that students take two years of a foreign language. This being the case, the majority of HL students begin their pre-kindergarten years in Spanish, but for the most part study their primary and secondary grade content areas in English. Once in high school, Spanish is reintroduced as a foreign language credit.

3.6.8 Public Domains

Public domains such as religious services, banking, and daily conversations at the supermarket provide further information as to this border population's bilingual language use (see Table 10). Spanish is heard in all public places; yet, its use varies depending upon the context and domain. For example, respondents indicated that Spanish (40.8%) or both languages (40.8%) were preferred in religious ceremonies. In fact, only 18.4% of the respondents indicated that they attended solely English-speaking religious events.

Interestingly, as seen on Table 10, respondents stated that they used both languages in brief public encounters such as those that take place at the supermarket 57% (n=28). Some indicated that they spoke Spanish, English, or mixed code, accommodating to the particular context or need of the interactants. English also became more prominent in the business-oriented environment of banking, where 65.3% (n=32) reported using only the superstrate language. Yet, 34.7% (n=17) continued to speak either Spanish or both

languages in this domain. The following student comments reveal that ‘selected functionality’ (Sridhar, 1996) fluctuates as divisions of formal and informal speech styles blur in the borderland’s public domain.

- Hablo español con mis amigos cuando estamos relajando, pero hablamos español e inglés al mismo tiempo. [I speak Spanish with my friends while relaxing, but we speak Spanish and English at the same time.]
- Prefiero hablar español cuando necesito asistir a una persona donde trabajo. [I prefer to speak Spanish when I need to help someone where I work.]
- Hablamos español cuando nos juntamos a comer o salir a una fiesta pero normalmente hablo inglés en la escuela y el trabajo.
[We speak Spanish when we get together to eat or go to a party, but I normally speak English at school or work.]
- Hablo los dos en mi trabajo. [I speak both at my work.]
- Me gusta poder hablar las dos lenguas en una conversación.
[I like to be able to speak both languages in a conversation.]
- Siempre hablamos español de cualquier tema y todo el tiempo.
[We always speak Spanish all the time no matter what the topic.]
- Hablo español sobre cualquier tema, música, películas, chismes, etc.
[I speak Spanish about any topic, music, movies, gossip, etc.]
- Todo depende del tema y con quien estoy. Prefiero hablar español cuando estoy con mis amistades y en inglés cuando estoy con alguien que me habla en inglés. [It all depends on the topic and who I’m with. I prefer to speak

Spanish when I'm with my friends and English when I'm with someone who speaks English to me.]

- Depende de la gente con quien esté conversando.

[It depends on the people to whom I am speaking.]

- Prefiero hablar en español cuando alguien no entiende inglés.

[I prefer to speak in Spanish when I'm with someone who doesn't understand English.]

Consequently, the observation can be made that although not holding equal status to English, Spanish continues to provide social cohesion among respondents in domains of varying informality and formality. People adjust their language use adapting to the person, situation, and context of the particular conversation.

Table 10: *Public domains*

Location	Spanish	English	Spanish and English	Response Count
Supermarket	16.3	26.5	57.2	49
Church	40.8	18.4	40.8	49
Bank	10.2	65.3	24.5	49
Social events	25	27.1	47.9	49

3.6.9 Language at Work

Language use at work clearly delineated separation between relational status (see Table 11). Respondents spoke more English with their boss (46.8%) than they did with their co-workers (25.5%). Similarly, they mixed languages much more with co-workers (42.6%) than they did with a figure-head (23.4%).

Table 11: *Language use at work*

Person	Spanish	English	Both	No Response	Response Count
Boss	8.5	46.8	23.4	21.3	49
Coworkers	10.6	25.5	42.6	21.3	49

Language use also varied according to domains and contexts as exemplified in Table 12. For example, English was identified as the primary formal language of meetings at work 55.3% (n=27). Less formal situations such as speaking with co-workers at lunch elicited more language variety, where over forty-six percent (46.8%) stated that they spoke Spanish and English or mixed code. Once outside of work when the context became more informal, language use changed even when respondents spoke with supervisory personnel. In these cases, respondents stated they preferred speaking both languages much more frequently even when conversing with a person considered to be of higher social status. Likewise, the more informal the situation, the more often U.S. Border

Spanish was used. Consequently, English appears to take precedence over Spanish in formal work situations while U.S. Spanish is the language of relationships and friendship.

Table 12: *Language with colleagues in different domains*

Place	Spanish	English	Both	No Response	Response Count
Meetings	6.4	55.3	17	21.3	49
At lunch	14.9	17	46.8	21.3	49
After work	10.6	36.2	31.9	21.3	49

3.6.10 Spanish Language Skills

This section, which is displayed in Table 13, examines the respondents' self-reported Spanish language skills, including comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing. As in the previous sections, students responded by answering "strongly agree", "agree", "neither agree nor disagree", "disagree", or "strongly disagree". For analytical purposes, student responses were assigned numerical values. Five (5) denoted "strongly agree" while one (1) denoted "strongly disagree."

As identified above, Spanish language biliteracy development in Laredo, Texas drops significantly after pre-kinder and again after third grade. In fact, by middle school, English is the major language of instruction. Thus, the researcher anticipated that respondents would rate their Spanish oral skills as "strong" due to intergenerational

contact and geographic proximity to Mexico, while confidence in literacy skills would decline.

As was anticipated, 95.9% of the respondents indicated they understood Spanish ‘very well’ or ‘well’. Additionally, 77.1% stated they felt comfortable speaking Spanish with a monolingual Spanish-speaking person from Mexico. However, respondents rated their level of confidence somewhat lower when it came to speaking in formal situations. While 70.9% (n=34) claimed they felt confident speaking in Spanish when in Spanish-language literature classes, 62.5% (n=30) of the respondents stated they felt comfortable speaking in formal situations. Thus, as the level of formality increased, speaker confidence decreased. Although respondents rated their literacy skills high, they reported 10% less confidence with their reading skills than with their oral comprehension skills.

Table 13: *Self-reported confidence with Spanish*

Skill Area	High level	Medium level	Low level	Response Count
Oral Comprehension	95.9	6.3	0	49
Reading	85.4	10.4	2.1	49
Writing	87.6	12.5	0	49

3.6.11 English Language Skills

This section continues by describing respondents’ self-reported English language skills and levels of English language confidence (see Table 14). The majority reported a

high confidence level toward their English oral language skills. Eighty-one percent (n=39) expressed confidence in speaking with a monolingual English speaker. However, upon closer examination, 48% percent (n=23) could remember a time when they felt uncomfortable speaking English with a professor, which indicates a degree of uncertainty in expressing speaking academic English. Confidence in literacy skills also remained high.

Table 14: *Self-reported confidence with English*

Skill Area	High Level	Medium Level	Low Level	Response Count
Oral Comprehension	97.9	2.1	0	49
Reading	95.8	2.1	2.1	49
Writing	87.5	12.5	0	49

Figures shown on Table 15 reveal that respondents ranked their overall language skills higher in English than in Spanish. Literacy skills were rated lower than speaking and comprehension skills, an anticipated outcome since most respondents had indicated that beyond middle-school they had been taught course content in English.

Table 15: *Comparison of Spanish and English Language confidence*

Self Reported Skills	English	Spanish	Response Count
Oral Comprehension	97.9	95.9	49
Reading	95.8	85.4	49
Writing	87.5	68.8	49

Since this description gives an account of self-reported student perceptions, it does not consider academic standing or performance in either language. It does, however, underscore the lack of Spanish language development beyond the initial primary school years, which impedes heritage language learners from developing formal registers and styles in both oral and literacy skills as well as confidence in those same skills. It also provides a descriptive analysis of language use as it pertains to the study's sample.

The following section will present both the quantitative and qualitative findings of student attitudes toward dialect awareness treatment.

4. ANALYSIS

As explained in Section 3, a mixed-methods approach was used to analyze dialect awareness as an instructional practice in Spanish heritage language classrooms. Student attitudes were captured through various data collection techniques and analyzed with both quantitative and qualitative methods. Section 4, which provides the analyses of these results, is divided into two sections. Section 4.1 covers the quantitative analysis of the pre- and post- survey instruments. These were submitted to various nonparametric Pearson Chi-square tests to analyze any possible significant changes in student attitudes across one semester of study. In Section 2, I present the qualitative analysis based on data retrieved from open-ended survey questions, classroom observations, and focus group interviews. These data were analyzed through interpretive description, content analysis, and discourse analysis techniques. This triangulation process makes it possible to examine students' attitudes toward language varieties and their opinions of the instructional practice termed dialect awareness from various perspectives. Consequently, I consider all aspects of this analysis to be interrelated, forming a solid inquiry into the instructional practices of dialect awareness.

4.1 Internal Survey Correlation

Upon perusal of previous research, no survey instrument was found that would measure HL learner attitudes toward a Spanish vernacular code and a prestige language variety. As a result, I developed a survey instrument (see Appendix A) to measure student attitudes in a pre/post survey format. Two pre-test question sets were first analyzed to determine if operational definitions of key terms would be used as a construct

or whether each question in the survey instrument would be analyzed separately. The term “language skills” was the first possible operational definition examined and was subsequently divided into oral language and literacy skills. Oral language skills included “understanding Spanish” (Q. 11) and “speaking Spanish with a native Spanish-speaking person” (Q 18), while literacy skills included “writing Spanish” (Q13) and “reading Spanish” (Q15). An internal correlation was estimated between each question. Cronbach results indicated an internal reliability coefficient for oral skills (.86) and literacy skills (.85). Thus, even though the two skill sets could have been operationally categorized, I chose to analyze each question separately by using the terminology listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills.

The second set of questions grouped under the title of “self-confidence when speaking Spanish in different domains” were also analyzed for internal reliability. If the responses were not indicative of a set, it was determined that each question would be analyzed separately. Questions included: (Q20) speaking Spanish with a Spanish professor, (Q21) speaking Spanish in formal situations, and (Q22) speaking Spanish in a Spanish literature class. Internal correlation did not exist across all questions. Questions 21 and 22 produced the coefficient alpha of .785 ($\alpha > .70$) while Question 20 produced a coefficient alpha of .586 ($\alpha < .70$). Consequently each question was analyzed separately.

The third question set was originally titled “language attitudes”. These included: (Q23) awareness of personally using mixed code, (Q26) belief that people mix English and Spanish when they don’t know Spanish well, (Q28) recognition that different reasons exist for using mixed code and (Q30) recognition that mixed code use is appropriate in

certain contexts. Internal reliability was not found among or between these questions; thus, each question was analyzed separately.

4.2 Spanish Confidence Levels

Several Chi-square tests were run to determine whether students' levels of self-confidence toward their production of Spanish in any of the skill areas had changed after one semester of study. This analysis related to Research Q1, which states, "Does dialect awareness increase HL student self-confidence in learning a prestige language variety?" Results showed that student confidence levels had increased in all skill areas although none were statistically significant. As can be seen in Table 15, confidence levels in listening comprehension ($\chi^2 = 1.024$, $df = 1$, $p = .312$) and writing skills ($\chi^2 = 1.805$, $df = 1$, $p = .179$), had increased the most.

Table 16: Spanish language confidence pre-post results

Category	Pre-Survey	Post-Survey	Chi-Square	Asymp.
	Mean Rank	Mean Rank		Sig.
Comprehension	39.52	44.16	1.024	.312*
Speaking	39.99	43.53	.564	.453*
Reading	40.41	42.96	.282	.595*
Writing	38.09	44.83	1.805	.179*

* $p > .05$

4.3 Language Confidence Findings

Next, questions that referred to speaking Spanish in different domains were submitted to several Pearson Chi-Square tests. These included, “speaking Spanish with a professor” (Q.20), “speaking Spanish in formal situations” (Q. 21), and “confidence in participating orally in Spanish literature classes” (Q. 22). The findings that are shown in Table 17 indicate that respondents’ confidence levels had increased when speaking Spanish with a professor ($\chi^2 = 1.763$, $df = 1$, $p = .184$); however, this numerical increase was not sufficient enough to be noted as statistically significant as analyzed with the study’s small sample size. Student confidence when speaking in formal settings ($\chi^2 = .846$, $df = 1$, $p = .358$) or in a literature class ($\chi^2 = .208$, $df = 1$, $p = .648$) had slight numerical increases but remained relatively stable when pre and post survey results are compared.

Table 17: Spanish in different domains pre-post results

Question	Pre-Survey	Post-Survey	Chi-Square	Asymp.
	Mean Rank	Mean Rank		Sig.
Q. 20	38.56	45.44	1.763	.184*
Q. 21	39.53	44.14	.846	.358*
Q. 22	40.53	42.80	.208	.648*

* $p > .05$

4.4 Language Attitudes

Student attitudes toward using U.S. Spanish after one semester were analyzed next. These included: (Q23) awareness of personally using mixed code; (Q24) pride in the way family members speak Spanish, (Q26) belief that people mix English and Spanish when they don't know Spanish well; (Q28) recognition that different reasons exist for using mixed code, and (Q30) recognition that mixed code use is appropriate in certain contexts. The corresponding research question asks, RQ 2: Does dialect awareness treatment impact student attitudes toward Spanish vernacular varieties? The significant level used was $p = 0.05$.

Data for the pre-post survey responses were submitted to statistical analysis to determine if any attitudinal changes occurred after one semester. As shown in Table 17, findings showed that participants' attitudes toward the production of U.S. Spanish shifted. After one semester, students more readily admitted to using U.S. Spanish dialect with friends and family in informal speaking contexts ($\chi^2 = 2.078$, $df = 1$, $p = .149$). In addition, a slight numerical increase occurred in students expressing pride in Spanish spoken with family and friend ($\chi^2 = .551$, $df = 1$, $p = .458$).

Table 18: *Language attitudes pre-post results*

Number	Category	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Chi-Square	Asump. Significance
1	Q. 23	38.45	45.60	2.078	.149*
2	Q. 24	40.19	43.26	.551	.458*
3	Q. 26	44.70	37.20	2.128	.145*

*p > 0.05

Respondents recognized that mixing languages was not a definitive indicator of a lack of fluency in the Spanish language ($\chi^2 = 2.128$, df = 1, p = .145). In line with this concept and statistically significant, respondents expressed their agreement that mixed code was used for different reasons ($\chi^2 = 6.438$, df = 1, p = .001) and that appropriateness in using mixed code depended upon the context ($\chi^2 = 5.029$, df = 1, p = .025).

Table 19: *Appropriate language use, pre-post results*

Question	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Chi-Square	Asymp. Signif.
Q. 28	36.30	48.49	6.438	.001*
Q. 30	35.36	46.85	5.029	.025*

*p < 0.05

Consequently, it can be concluded from this quantitative analysis that although DA participants had not demonstrated statistically significant changes in their levels of confidence when using Spanish, they had increased their understanding of the factors that impact languages in contact. Respondents were more accepting of their own bilingual language production, recognizing when they used mixed code. They also recognized that use and appropriateness depended upon different sociolinguistic factors. Such recognition can promote an understanding of positive ethnolinguistic identity.

The following qualitative examination more deeply analyzes and describes DA classroom practices. Limitations to the study will follow.

4.5 Qualitative Survey Analysis

Section 4.5 contains the qualitative analysis of dialect awareness (DA) as it was applied in this study. It includes an examination of the particular DA teaching and learning practices, a description of the student-teacher relationships that were developed in the classroom environment, and an analysis of the instructional materials that were used. Three types of data were gathered to inform this section: (a) open-ended survey responses, (b) audio-recorded classroom conversations, and (c) audio-recorded focus group discussions.

First, the open-ended survey responses that examine students' opinions regarding specific instructional practices and DA exercises are described. Next, data from the open-ended survey questions, classroom observations, field notes, and audio-recordings are compiled into a descriptive analysis. Each section describes a particular DA exercise, beginning with an overview of the open-ended survey responses and

concluding with a descriptive analysis based upon the data mentioned above. In some instances, common themes consistently reoccur in the data. When this happens, I note the occurrence and create categories to identify and describe the overarching themes. Also, as previously explained in Section 3, I have provided several discourse examples to examine dialect awareness in the classroom. Segments of this discourse make reference to the interface between instructor's practices, dialect awareness exercises, and student engagement.

Finally, three focus group interviews, each representing a DA treatment classroom, are examined for the salient points regarding ethnolinguistic identity experiences in the DA classroom. This composite analysis supplements the quantitative results examined above and provides comparison across different data sources to facilitate triangulation (Merrigan & Huston, 2004).

4.5.1 Open-ended Survey Responses to Dialect Awareness

The majority of students' open-ended survey comments indicated that the totality of instructional practices, classroom dialogues, readings, and interactive materials had piqued their interest in learning about bilingualism. Four salient themes emerged from these responses. First, respondents noted that the sociolinguistic themes broadened their knowledge and understanding of bilingualism. Second, particular DA exercises increased students' empathy toward less fluent bilinguals. Third, respondents were motivated to learn a standard Spanish language variety. Finally, pre-service teachers indicated that they would apply the lessons they had learned to their future teaching. The quotations used below that elaborate on these themes are representative of the more

commonly held opinions stated in the survey.

Students repeatedly voiced the observation that sociolinguistic themes covered in class had helped them understand bilingualism from different perspectives. In broad terms, this new knowledge led participants to better understand the multiple factors that influence language within a speech community as well as impact an individual's language use and acquisition. One said, "being bilingual is more than knowing two languages. It involves culture, heritage, and environment among others." Another stated, "It (the class) made me aware of all the things that take place when two languages are in contact with each other." Another student stated that the class helped her gain "an understanding of the social motivations for code switching." Respondents learned to apply Spanish linguistic terminology to their own language experiences as well as to explain bilingualism in more precise linguistic terms. One student stated, "I had a vague understanding of the concepts, but with this class I've had the opportunity to know what professionals study in the linguistics field research, making the concepts more clear. I could understand better how languages work and what their differences are." As can be appreciated in the discourse passages found in this section, students' language was laced with terms such as "arcaísmos", "cambio de código intraoracional", "alternancia de código", "préstamos", "registros", "anglicismos", and "lenguas en contacto". Students examined their own communicative practices and learned a metalanguage to describe linguistic phenomena.

The sociolinguistic lessons also helped HL learners to distinguish between vernacular dialect and Standard Spanish. They became more astute HL speakers as their

awareness of context, style, and registers increased. In fact, students frequently mentioned that these topics helped them to clarify the differences between vernacular Spanish and the Standard variety. One respondent stated, “Now I know about registers and that there’s nothing wrong about code-switching, just knowing where and how to apply it is the key.” Another said, “This helped me understand that using each language/dialect depending on the situation one finds themselves.” Another said, “Now I know that there is a time and place where to use certain dialects.” Finally, another student offered her newly found understanding of the relationship between language and identity when she stated, “El Tex-Mex es algo que no se puede disminuir de nuestra cultura por la simple razón de que es la manera que hablamos en Laredo. Es bueno saber el español “correcto”, pero no es necesario borrar nuestra lengua. Es parte de nuestra manera de comunicarnos y no hay que hacerlo menos.” [Tex-Mex is something that we can’t make less of in our culture simply because it’s the way we talk in Laredo. It’s good to know correct Spanish, but it isn’t necessary to erase our language. It’s part of the way we communicate and we don’t have to think less of it”]. These comments and positive responses to the sociolinguistic material indicate that students valued this contextualized learning experience. While the course content validated students’ worldview through language usage, affective instructional practices also influenced students to become more empathetic of others’ oral language skills.

In fact, empathy was identified as the second salient commentary in the open-ended responses. Students noted a heightened sensitivity to other bilingual language speakers and a sense of acceptance toward their own speech production. One

commentator said, “Now I have a more clear [*sic*] idea of why people talk the way they talk, and to comprehend and not just judge.” Another restated the same sentiment by saying she better understood “why people in this area speak the way they do.” One effectively summarized her sentiments when she said, “I am not crazy; I am BILINGUAL!” The composite picture of these quotes suggests that when class instruction prompts a sensitivity toward the delicate balance between language and identity, students feel less inclined to position themselves against each other. The more fluent students are supportive of their less fluent counterparts. In turn, less fluent HL speakers feel more comfortable participating. Thus, the survey results provide an indication that hierarchical classroom patterns shifted when DA material was applied to classroom instruction.

A number of open-ended survey questions reflected this shift as students openly expressed acceptance of their own and others’ non-standard Spanish language usage. One student said, “I believe that taking courses like this can help anyone learn better Spanish in the process of learning the class material. I know that I was able to speak out in Spanish much more to the teacher.” Another stated, “reading the Spanish assigned readings and speaking in Spanish about the topic without fear of misusing the language helped a lot.” Another stated, “In our last class project I was very surprised how professional I sounded. I knew what words to use to describe my project because of what we had learned in class.” This attitudinal shift will be revisited in greater detail when discussing the DA exercises found below.

Evidence from the open-ended questions also demonstrated an increased intrinsic

motivation to learn Standard Spanish. A number of students noted that the critical pedagogical lessons had bridged the academic learning of Spanish with their own experiences of living a bilingual life. One student stated, “The fact that Anzaldúa said, “I am my language” made me more proud of who I am and of my native language (Spanish).” Another expressed a greater acceptance toward her native tongue when she said, “It (the class) helped me embrace the language.” Numerous comments included the same sense of ownership to language and a recognition of the value in learning an academic register. One stated, “The professor allowed us to speak as best we could without reprimanding us for the use of codeswitching or borrowing. This not only helped me learn what was inappropriate but how to adjust my register in a more professional setting.” Yet another student said, “The way the teacher would speak to us made me feel comfortable to speak in Spanish and to express myself and when and as we got different exercises, I learned that some of the words I was using were not the appropriate ones.” These sentiments were expressed throughout student comments, recognizing one of the primary premises of this research; that the reduction of stigma attached to students’ vernacular language will produce positive attitudinal changes toward further language development.

Finally, several respondents stated that the course better prepared them professionally to meet their future bilingual students’ needs. One said, “Going back to my first block (teaching practicum) I realized that my bilingual culture can help those students or others who possess a similar culture to that of mine interact with English native speakers. I can understand what they may be trying to express in a conversation

and explain it to others.” Another stated, “Esta clase nos va a ayudar a entender a los estudiantes cuando entran por una forma del dialecto que no es regular. Vamos a poder entenderlo y poder guiarlos a que hablen el estandar.” [“This class is going to help us understand our students when they speak in a non-standard dialect. We are going to understand it (the dialect) and be able to guide them to speak a standard variety”].

Another said, “As a teacher, I think that we should have a positive outlook on borrowing and code-switching and not look down on the children that speak in this manner because it is part of their identity. I would, however, have strategies and activities prepared for teaching the students a more standard way of speaking, never undermining their uniqueness, but highlighting the importance of the usage of academic language in particular domains. As an educator I believe that we have to use and create tools from what the students bring with them to the classroom and that includes their language.”

These comments indicate that the DA instructional practices helped students to increase their own language awareness while they also reflected upon their future endeavors as Spanish and bilingual language teachers. Students examined the relationship between language and identity in their own experiences, which caused them to think of their future roles and responsibilities.

The next section will continue by examining respondents’ reactions to each of the six highlighted DA exercises.

4.5.2 Six Dialect Awareness Exercises

Survey respondents were asked to rate the six dialect awareness (DA) exercises listed as: (a) Reflective exercises (Koike & Klee, 1994), (b) bidialectal contrast

exercises (Roca, 2005), (c) *Las Cartas a Rosa* (Sánchez, 2003), (d) *Hablar en “F”*, (e) *Los Apodos* (Martínez, 2003), and (f) *Estilos & Registros* (Azevedo, 1992). Students identified which, if any, of these exercises helped them to understand what it meant to be bilingual and/or which helped them to gain more confidence in using Spanish.

Results indicated that over 50% of the respondents found all exercises to be beneficial to their learning. As can be seen in Table 20, Koike’s reflective exercises received the highest approval rate while 52.6% of the respondents identified the childhood game, “Hablar en F” as being beneficial to their learning.

Table 20: *Student approval rate for DA exercises and activities*

Exercise/Activity	Rated High Approval
Reflective Exercises (Koike, 1994)	90.9
Estilos y registros (professor-created, based on Azevedo, 1992)	78.9
Las cartas a Rosa (Sánchez, 2003)	77.3
Bidialectal Contrast (Roca, 2005)	73.3
Los apodos	71.4
(Martínez, 2005)	
Hablar en “F”	52.6

4.5.3 Reflective Exercises by Koike and Klee

Participants gave Koike and Klee’s reflective exercises, found in the textbook

Lingüística aplicada (pp. 161-189), the highest marks of all those used. The treatment groups' survey responses demonstrated how the exercise applied to students' lived experiences, helping them to learn terminology and concepts relevant to their future teaching career. To analyze student responses, I separated these into two groups. Group A was comprised of those students who spoke a Standard Spanish and had a broad Spanish repertoire. Group B was comprised of HL students whose primary communicative code was a non-standard Spanish variety. Individuals in Group A were comfortable speaking Spanish in an academic domain. They exuded a high degree of confidence in class and demonstrated "cognitive learning behavior" by manipulating the linguistic terminology as it pertained to U.S. Spanish varieties. For example, students cited common calques including "moppear" (to mop) and "registrar para una clase" (register for a class) to explain lexical phenomena in the local vernacular. They admitted that "friends" used code-switching as a linguistic characteristic, but many in this group claimed they rarely spoke U.S. Border Spanish, preferring to use a standard variety.

In contrast, students who were in Group B spoke Spanish in the home environment; yet, much of their educational and social interactions were conducted in English. This second group established two levels of learning through the exercise: (1) the same linguistic meta-language that fluent standard Spanish speakers learned, and (2) new knowledge of the standard variety. Since U.S. Border Spanish was often their unmarked code, Group B readily used examples that were common to their language repertoire. Similar to the first group, Group B employed the exercise to retrieve these vernacular dialect examples, using linguistic terms to explain their occurrences. For

example, some students applied newly acquired meta-language to recall archaisms such as “ansina,” “haiga” and “naiden,” commonly heard in U.S. Border Spanish. Others described lexical variety found in U.S. Border Spanish and recognized they employed code-switching in their speech. Essentially, Group B became more creative in their responses than Group A by using the vernacular variety to demonstrate the lessons being learned. One student in Group B played with language when he wrote an example of intrasentential codeswitching, “Critics say that codeswitching es una falta de inteligencia y que es algo que la gente recurre a falta de knowledge sobre la lengua en la que se desea hablar.” [Critics say that codeswitching is a lack of intelligence and that it is something that people turn to due to lack of knowledge about the language in which they wish to speak.] This creative outlet prompted other students to give examples of vernacular language, which they could now name by applying meta-language. Group B also recognized that at times they did not know the distinction between vernacular and Standard Spanish lexical items. For example, some students were amazed to learn that “troca” (pick-up truck) and “las vistas” (movies) were not acceptable lexical terms in Standard Spanish. When they became aware of these nuances in a supportive learning environment, students willingly opened themselves to learn Standard Spanish lexicon.

This apparently simple set of questions was also taught by means of affect as students shared their experiences through the vernacular dialect. The second question in this set particularly speaks to an affective approach: “¿Por qué se ven estigmatizados algunos dialectos? Dé ejemplos de tales dialectos.” [Why are some dialects considered to be stigmatized? Give examples of such dialects]. Although the question is objective

in tone, it opened the opportunity for students to discuss personal experiences of stigmatization and stratification. In this case, HL learners discussed the relationship between the common vernacular language variety, U.S. Border Spanish, and the standard Spanish expected of them in the academic setting. One student explained, “It helped me by knowing that everything we use is for a reason and has its name.” The reflective nature of the questions placed students at the center of their learning, applying linguistic constructs to their experiences.

Consequently, both groups used four increasingly complex levels of cognitive development found in Bloom’s Taxonomy (1956): knowledge, comprehension, application and analysis. Group A recalled linguistic features of the dialect, and Group B demonstrated creativity in comparing and contrasting the distinctions between the two dialects. Group A also demonstrated more empathy toward their less fluent classmates as they learned the sociolinguistic concepts through shared reflective practice. One native-Spanish speaker said, “A mi me critican porque tengo un acento marcado en inglés. Ahora me doy cuenta que no debemos juzgarles a los que aplican la alternancia de código con frecuencia porque no somos mejores, solamente somos diferentes. Aquí podemos compartir nuestras experiencias y ayudarnos el uno al otro.” [“They criticize me because I have a marked accent in English. Now I realize that we shouldn’t judge those that use codeswitching because we’re not better, just different. Here we can share our experiences and help each other.”] Thus, Koike’s exercise provided the conduit for students to be both more compassionate toward fellow classmates and to use existing knowledge of U.S. Border Spanish to gain insight into their own language production.

4.5.4 Styles and Registers

The second most highly rated exercise was Estilos & Registros (language styles and registers), inspired by Azevedo (1992). The section presents five registers, with the most formal being “protocolar” and the least formal being “íntimo.” Students read the section and reviewed the definitions of each register. They also discussed a passage from Azevedo in which he states that the speech community determines how formality is defined. The reading states,

La variación lingüística relacionada con la formalidad del contexto comunicativo no es absoluta, sino que abarca una amplia gama de gradaciones no siempre fáciles de precisar. Sin embargo, puede analizarse mediante un sistema de niveles llamados registros (figura 8.16). La dimensión de formalidad depende estrictamente del consenso de la comunidad de habla. Cuanto más formal el contexto, tanto más rigurosamente se define lo que se puede decir y como se debe hacerlo (pp. 358-359).

[Linguistic variation in relation to the formality of the communicative context isn't absolute. Rather, it covers a wide range of gradations not always easy to define. Nevertheless, variation can be analyzed through a system of levels called registers (figure 8.19). The dimension of formality strictly depends on the consensus of the speech community. The more formal the context, the more rigorous it is to determine what can be said and how it can be said (pp. 360-361)].

With this frame of reference, the professor introduced the page-long exercise (see

Appendix D), explaining that the purpose was to identify and discuss different registers as they were used at the U.S./Mexico border. Students were asked to review a number of statements to determine if a level of formality could be identified for each. The professor encouraged students to select their responses and to then defend their points of view. Once they had completed the task, students discussed how different styles and registers were used in their own speech community. Nearly eighty percent of the respondents strongly agreed that this exercise helped them to understand the complexity of being bilingual.

The discourse excerpt below demonstrates a discussion that centered around one of the examples. Please note that since all discourse excerpts are verbatim, they demonstrate spoken speech production, not written form.

Passage 1

- 1 P: Ahora vamos a analizar la 17.
 - 2 P: (reading) “¿Has escuchado la charla de Al Gore sobre el calentamiento
 - 3 P: global?” Esto me interesa muchísimo.
 - 4 P: [S1], dices que es familiar, ¿por qué?
 - 5 S1: por la palabra “charla”
 - 6 P: ¿“Charla” no te parece académico o formal?
 - 7 S1: Formal no.
 - 8 S2: Charla no la usamos a diario como por decir, ay buey voy a hablar
 - 9 S2: contigo, vamos a platicar.
 - 10 S3: Yo creo que el contexto le da a charlar la formalidad
 - 11 S4: Si, por la palabra charla...
 - 12 S5: Como si fuera... (students speaking at once)
 - 13 S6: Estás hablando...
 - 14 S6: Le estás hablando familiar, estás tuteando.
 - 15 S5: Has escuchado? (indiscernible)...como, ya oíste.
 - 16 S5: Escuchar lo hace más formal.
 - 17 S6: Estás tuteando...
-
- 1 P: Now we're going to analyze number 17.
 - 2 P: (reading) “¿Have you heard of Al Gore's speech about global

- 3 P: warming?" This interests me a lot.
 4 P: [S1], you say this is a familiar register. Why?
 5 P: Because of the word "charla" (informal conference talk)
 6 S1: "charla" doesn't seem to you to be academic or formal?
 7 S1: Not formal.
 8 S2: We don't use the word "charla" in daily conversation as if to say
 9 S2: hey guy, I'm going to talk with you, or let's talk.
 10 S3: I think it's the context that gives the word "charla" a formality.
 11 S4: Yes, because of the word 'charla'
 12 S5: As if it were... (students speaking at once)
 13 S6: You're talking...
 14 S6: You're talking in the familiar form. You're 'tuteando'
 15 S5: Have you heard? (indiscernible)...it's like you already heard.
 16 S5: The word 'to hear' makes it more formal.
 17 S6: but you're using the informal 'tú'...

As can be observed, students are animated in the discussion while they determine if the sentence can be categorized into informal, neutral, or formal. They touch on different aspects of the sentence such as the lexicon, the use of the informal tú, and the context in which the sentence is spoken to determine its level of formality. The animated discussion and the noted disagreement among viewpoints suggest that the students feel comfortable in this open discussion. Rather than refraining from responding, wondering if their answers were correct, the six students who participated in this brief excerpt, demonstrate that an engaged learning conversation is occurring within a dynamic classroom atmosphere. This pattern of classroom discourse will be noted in the excerpts that follow, which analyze two textbook exercises.

4.5.5 "Nuevos Mundos"

Survey results show that 73.3% found Roca's bidialectal contrast exercise to help them understand bilingualism and to learn a standardized variety. Responses indicated that the lesson had helped respondents bridge their understanding of vernacular Spanish

varieties to learn Standard Spanish. One student stated, “The exercise, coupled with the reading assignment, was beneficial to my understanding of borrowing. I found the concept easy to understand. By writing my own understanding and then finding the official meaning in the dictionary brought to light how easily we borrow from the English language to express ourselves.” Another student indicated that she became more comfortable using prestige lexicon. She stated, “Hay préstamos que uso frecuentemente y yo no sabía que tenían otro significado en español, por ejemplo, yo no sabía que un clip es un sujetador. Esto me ayudará a poder hablar y escribir un español formal.” (“There are borrowings that I use frequently and I didn’t know they had a different meaning in Spanish. For example, I didn’t know that a paper clip is called “sujetador” in Spanish. This will help me to speak and write a formal Spanish”). Thus, in recognizing which lexicon is marked as non-standard, students begin to decipher the usage of vocabulary deemed acceptable when speaking Standard Spanish.

Further understanding of the process involved in this shift from vernacular into Standard Spanish can be better explicated through classroom discourse. The following excerpts were taken from one class session when the professor used the exercise entitled, “Querido Johncito,” (Roca, 2005, p. 57). The footnote to this exercise states, “La carta se publicó en la revista *Ecos*, 12 de marzo de 1955, p. 34. Se cita en *A Study of the Influence of English on the Spanish of Puerto Ricans of Jersey City, New Jersey*, tesis doctoral de Charles W. Kreidler, Univ. De Michigan, 1957” (p. 57). Particular attention was paid to this exercise since the analysis demonstrates how students and professor explore a dialect variety much like U.S. Border Spanish, yet with distinct variables that

engage students in a contrastive analysis.

Themes gleaned from examining the discourse have been divided into three categories for this analysis: (1) terminology, (2) relationships, and (3) confidence. The professor first presented the class with a framework to analyze the mixed-code by asking students to identify the lexicon presented in the text, clarify it in Standard Spanish, and discuss it using academic terminology.

Passage 2

Professor (P): ¿Qué opinan de esta carta para Johncito? Fíjense bien la nota de aquí de la página dice que la carta se publicó en 1955. Yo cuando la leí ayer dije, “bueno, ayer la escribió [Eduardo].” Parece una carta actual. ¿Me pueden decir que encuentran ustedes en esta carta, ya tomando todo lo que hemos visto en clase? Tomando en consideración eso, ¿qué encuentran en esta cartita?

Professor (P): What do you think about this letter to Johncito? Notice that the note here on the page says that the letter was published in 1955. When I read it yesterday, I said, “Well, Eduardo (a student in class) wrote it yesterday.” It sounds like a recent letter. Can you tell me what you find in this letter based on everything we’ve covered in class? Considering everything, what do you find in this little letter?

These opening questions lead to an extensive dialogue about the mixed code found in the text. Students and professor began to decipher the words uncommon to U.S. Border Spanish or unclear because of their spelling. Even though students noted that some lexicon was not typically used in U.S. Border Spanish, terms could be understood because of their English influence. The exercise and instructional practices allowed students to compare familial language use to the text. The dialogic excerpt found below demonstrates how classroom talk turns to experience as a student discusses her father’s life. The daughter first discusses her father’s language use and then applies it to the Roca exercise:

Passage 3

1 P: Entonces dice Paola que a su papá usa algunas de estas palabras
 2 P: y cruzó, cuando?
 3 S1: Como en uh...49, 50 51.. algo así
 4 P: [Bu...bueno es de esta época entonces,
 5 P: la época de esta carta
 6 S1: Y yo le digo que ¿por qué? porque él aprendió inglés pero por lírica
 7 P: Exacto
 8 S1: Pero estas palabras nunca dejó de utilizarlas. Y hasta la fecha. Y ahora
 9 S1: se le está olvidando el inglés pero estas palabras no se las olvidan. Y
 10 S1: él siempre dice 'la yarda' y 'la carpeta.'
 11 S2: ¿Quién?
 12 S1: [Mi papá
 13 S2: [Sí y mi mamá también
 14 P: ¿Sí?
 15 S2: Y mi abuelita
 16 P: Y viven en el lado americano.
 17 S1: Sí...sí
 18 S2: Sí, claro
 19 S: Nacieron allá y todo..pero...como a veces..la librería o las vistas
 20 P: Entonces este tipo de palabras
 21 S2: [o el principal
 22 S2: Aquí son las vistas, verdad, cuando uno va al cine.

1 P: So Paola says that her dad uses some of these words.
 2 P: And when did he enter the country?
 3 S1: Uh, like in 49, 50 51.. something like that
 4 P: [So...he's from that time period then
 5 P: the period of this letter
 6 S1: And I ask, why? Because he learned English through hearing it.
 7 P: Exactly
 8 S1: But he never stopped using these words. Even today.
 9 S1: And now he's forgetting English but he never forgets these words.
 10 S1: He always says 'la yarda' (false cognate for yard) and 'la carpeta' (false
 11 S1: cognate for carpet)
 12 S2: ¿Who?
 13 S1: [My dad
 14 S2: [Yeah, my mom too
 15 P: Really?
 16 S2: And my grandmother
 17 P: And they live on the U.S. side of the border
 18 S1: Yes...Yes
 19 S2: Of course

- 20 S1: They were born on the Mexican side and everything...but ...like
 21 S1: sometimes 'la librería (false cognate for library) or 'las vistas' (movies)
 22 P: So these types of words...
 23 S2: or the "principal" (false cognate)
 24 S2: Here we say "las vistas" when we go to the movies, right?

This classroom exchange became animated as students demonstrated their interest in the personal narrative. Throughout, the professor maintained her same lesson objective of using terminology in reference to the text as noted in lines 6 and 7, but students are more intent at this point on relating their family stories. This delays the planned lesson, but it serves a different purpose, that of relating content to experience. Students construct their understanding of mixed code as they speak.

Passage 4

- 1 S2: Como mi familia ha sido... como se dice... like exposed to
 2 S1: Expuestos
 3 S2: [Expuestos
 4 S2: al lenguaje este
 5 P: ¿Qué lenguaje es ese que dices? ¿Al inglés? Quiero que...
 6 S2: [Al dialecto
 7 P: Eso es lo que quiero que ahora, usando estas palabras
 8 P: le den un nombre y expliquen estos conceptos
 9 P: Es el español de la frontera, ¿verdad? Y ya sabemos que es diferente
 10 P: al español de...cualquier otra región...
 11 S1: [Pero lo curioso es que mi papá ni
 12 S1: estuvo en la frontera. Apenas son como 14 años de estar en la frontera
 13 S1: Él estuvo en California, pero en una área muy pequeña donde no se
 14 S1: hablaba español solamente los empleados... eh hablaban español
 15 P: [Entonces,
 16 P: ¿Qué sacas como conclusión de esas palabras que usa tu papá?
 17 S1: Están generalizadas en los inmigrantes
 18 P: Exacto. Entonces estamos hablando de qué...
 19 S1: [Porque el estuvo en California, en
 20 S1: Colorado y en Alaska...O sea en Colorado para nada se hablaba
 21 S1: español en aquel entonces. Pero siempre entre...en el area del trabajo
 22 S1: hablaba en español...entre ellos
 23 P: [Entre ellos
 24 S1: Pero hablar con, no sé con todos siempre tenía que ser en inglés

- 25 S2: ...En inglés
 26 S1: Absolutamente, nada de español
 27 P: ¡Fascinante! Entonces podemos hablar de una comunidad de habla
 28 P: ¿Quién recuerda de ese concepto del capítulo 8 de Koike?
- 1 S2: Like my family has been... how do you say... like exposed to
 2 S1: Expuestos
 3 S2: [exposed to
 4 S2: the language
 5 P: ¿What language are you talking about? ¿English? I want you to...
 6 S2: [To the dialect
 7 P: This is what I'd like that now, using these words
 8 P: explain the concepts with appropriate terms
 9 P: You're talking about Spanish used at the border, right? And we know
 10 P: that it's different than Spanish in any other region.
 11 S1: [But the curious thing is that
 12 S1: My dad hadn't even lived at the border. He's been here now for 14
 13 S1: years. He was in California, but in a rural area where Spanish wasn't
 14 S1: spoken only the workers...uh spoke Spanish.
 15 P: [so what conclusion can you make
 16 P: about the words that your father uses?
 17 S1: They're generalized in the immigrant population
 18 P: Exactly. So we're talking about...
 19 S1: [Because he was in California, in
 20 S1: Colorado and in Alaska...In other words no one spoke Spanish in
 21 S1: in Colorado back then. But the workers always spoke Spanish
 22 S1: among themselves
 23 P: [among themselves
 24 S1: But talking with others, I don't know, they always had to speak in
 25 S1: English
 26 S2: ...In English!
 27 S1: Absolutely not a word of Spanish.
 28 P: Fascinating! So we can talk about the speech community?
 29 P: ¿Who remembers this concept from Section 8 in Koike?

In observing this excerpt, I first note that the length of turns has increased substantially. Language is being used 'beyond language learning' (Markee, 2000, p. 93), as the narrator takes the class into a personal example that has relevance to the lesson. Second, multilayered talk is noted in that Student 1 relates a story while the professor maintains the instructional objective of the lesson throughout the passage. As the class

listens to the story, a second, less fluent student interjects that her family has been exposed to this type of discourse. She cites a lexical item, ‘las vistas’, commonly heard in the local speech community.

The multilayered talk returns to an instructional focus as the professor leads students back to the premise of the lesson; use the terminology by giving examples from the text and personal use. In fact, in this passage the professor has referred three times to the premise of the lesson; categorize the vocabulary into the academic terminology. At the same time, however, the professor validates the student’s narrative (¡Fascinante!) before she builds upon the student’s (S1) description of her father’s language use to revisit the terms ‘community of practice’, ‘anglicisms’ and ‘archaisms’.

The next excerpt turns to even more complex sociolinguistic information as speech community members explore the definition of the term ‘archaism’. Their perspective as in-group members is wrought with significance as they establish that their own speech contains such lexicon termed ‘archaisms’ by researchers.

Passage 5

- 1 P: ¿Qué son arcaísmos, ¿te acuerdas?
- 2 S1: Asina, truje, haiga
- 3 P: El artículo de Blanco dice que los arcaísmos todavía existen pero la
- 5 P: definición de otros autores explica que los
- 6 P: arcaísmos ya están en desuso
- 7 S2: Si...Ya desaparecieron del uso común
- 8 P: Entonces, [S1] está en contra de esas definiciones, ¿por qué?
- 9 S1: Porque yo digo ‘haiga’ y todavía se usa, porque yo lo uso, ¿verdad?
- 10 P: Entonces qué interesante esto de los arcaísmos.
- 11 S1: Entonces no es una palabra desaparecida o esas palabras alguien la
- 12 S1: puede considerar si realmente los arcaísmos son palabras que
- 13 S1: desaparecieron
- 14 S2: Aquí en muchos lugares se usan
- 15 S3: ...definirlos de otra manera

- 16 P: ¿Qué opinan de usar los arcaísmos?
 17 S3: Ya se quedaron esas palabras en su generación
 18 P: Entonces, ¿Qué características encuentran en el español que hablamos?
 19 S3: Tiene muchas palabras que se consideran como arcaísmos.
 20 P: Arcaísmos.
- 1 P: What are archaisms? [S1], Do you remember?
 2 S1: Asina, truje, haiga
 3 P: Yes
 4 P: Blanco's article says that archaic expressions still exist
 5 P: but the definitions of other authors explain that archaic terms are no
 6 P: longer used.
 7 S2: Yes...that they disappeared from common use
 8 P: So, [S1] is against this definition. Why?
 9 S1: Because I say 'haiga' and it's still used because I use it, right?
 10 P: So this is so interesting about archaic expressions.
 11 S1: So it's not a lost word or you can't consider them archaic if in fact
 12 S1: archaisms are words that have disappeared.
 13 S2: They're used here in many places
 14 S3: ...define them in a different way
 15 P: What do you think about using archaisms?
 16 S3: These words stayed with a generation
 17 P: So, what characteristics can you find in the Spanish we speak?
 18 S3: It has a lot of words that others consider archaic.
 19 P: Archaisms.

Of note in this passage, the professor lets S1 express her disagreement with one academic definition of archaisms. The student recognizes that in her community such usage is common. She then asks how the definition can state that these terms are in disuse. Reference to Blanco (2001) is made. Student 1 agrees with Blanco's analysis of archaic words in which Blanco states, "Un verdadero arcaísmo, sería una palabra o expresión que ha desaparecido totalmente del idioma. En realidad, las expresiones que existen en Texas no son arcaísmos en vista de que están en pleno uso, no sólo en Texas sino también en otras regiones del mundo de habla hispana" (p. 10). [...a real archaism would be a word or expresión that has totally disappeared from the language. In reality

the expressions that exist in Texas aren't archaic since they are in complete usage, not only in Texas but in other regions of the Spanish-speaking world"]. The professor does not add or detract from this observation. Rather she gives the student space to speak and then returns to the observation that U.S. Border Spanish contains many words considered by some as archaisms.

The pace quickens as the lesson turns to an appraisal of false cognates commonly heard in the regional dialect. Some students recognize that they use lexicon not found in general Spanish variety. Students who are more fluent in Standard Spanish suggest lexical items that are considered more acceptable in Panhispanic circles. This discussion demonstrates that students of differing fluency levels help each other to understand the terminology in both standard and vernacular varieties.

Passage 6

- 1 P: El libro menciona los clásicos y los voy a leer
- 2 P: “Aplicar” – voy a aplicar para la beca
- 3 P: ¿Cuál sería la palabra mas...académica
- 4 S1: Solicitar
- 5 S2: Voy a solicitar.
- 6 P: Voy a “correr” para...diputado ... ‘to run for’
- 7 S1: Lanzarme
- 8 P: Lanzar
- 9 S2: Voy a postularme
- 10 S3: Verdad, pero aquí todos corren para mayor (risa)
- 11 P: [alcalde]
- 12 S4: Y no delgazan (risa)
- 13 P: Me voy a “mover” a otra casa
- 14 P: ¿Sí, lo usas Juana?
- 15 P: Me voy a mover de casa
- 16 S1: Sí
- 17 S2: Cambiar
- 18 P: ...Mudar
- 19 S1: Yo siempre digo – me voy a mover de casa
- 20 P: Obviamente las personas bilingües de la comunidad dicen “mover”

- 21 P: Pero un hablante nativo de otra región va a decir
 22 P: me voy a mudar de casa, o me voy a cambiar también.
 23 S1: Y mover de casa, está bien? Es correcto?
 24 P: Ah muy buena pregunta.
 25 P: Tú dime
 26 S1: Pero, ¿es el español académico, formal?
 27 P: No. ¿Cómo dijo María? Mudar.
 28 S1: Sí, pero mudar no se usa mucho aquí.
 29 S4: No se escucha mucho.
 30 P: Fíjense lo que comenta, aquí no se escucha la palabra ‘mudar’.
- 1 P: The book mentions the classic ones and I’m going to read them.
 2 P: ‘Aplicar’ (false cognate) I’m going to apply for a
 3 P: scholarship. What would be a more academic word?
 4 S1: Solicitar
 5 S2: I’m going to apply (solicitar).
 6 P: I’m going “correr” (to run) for congress
 7 S1: campaign for
 8 P: campaign
 9 S2: I’m going to be a candidate for
 10 S3: Right, but here everyone runs for mayor (creating a pun)
 11 S4: And they don’t get any thinner (laughter)
 12 P: I’m going to move (mover) to another house
 13 P: Do you use it Juana?
 14 P: I’m going to move (mover)
 15 S1: Yes
 16 S2: Change
 17 P: “mudar”
 18 S1: I always say, “me voy a mover de casa”
 19 P: Obviously bilingual individuals from our community say “mover”
 20 P: but a native speaker from a different region would use the verb
 21 P: “mudar” or I’m going (“cambiar”).
 22 S1: Is the verb ‘mover’ correct?
 23 P: That’s a good question. You tell me.
 24 S1: But is it academic or formal Spanish?
 25 P: No. What did María say? Mudar.
 26 S1: Yes, but that word isn’t used much here.
 27 S4: It’s not heard much.
 28 P: Listen to what she says, “The word mudar isn’t heard here.”

One student jokes with language usage (lines 10 & 11). As recognized by Barker (1974), bilingual speakers commonly use code-switching to ‘play with language.’

These examples demonstrate the ease with which language becomes entertaining. At the same time, this light banter as an undertone to the lesson indicates the class comfort level. When Student 1 asks if her usage of ‘mover’ is correct, the professor refers to another student’s previous response. With this indirect answer, S1 recognizes that she uses vernacular Spanish terminology. She also notes that the option, ‘mudar’ is not commonly heard. Another student agrees. This comment validates students’ use of the vernacular code in their own community as the text also demonstrates how through dialectic exchange students devise a new understanding of Standard Spanish lexical items.

The final topic discussed in this analysis highlights the main theme to this study, lowering the stigma attached to the vernacular while increasing confidence in learning a general Spanish variety. The question in analysis is whether DA treatment increases students’ mindful awareness to change certain linguistic features. Again, the analysis turns to classroom discourse to hear students speak:

Passage 7

- 1 S1: a mi marido me dice.. que yo tengo mucho la costumbre de decir ‘taba’
- 2 S1: en vez de ‘estaba’
- 3 S1: y me dice, ah... ¿vas a ser maestra? Y yo ay (risa)
- 4 P1: Sí, ¿y cómo justificas eso? en tu casa dices...taba...por
- 5 S1: [Es que hay
- 6 S1: la...yo creo que es la costumbre porque....y es que me lo he
- 7 S1: propuesto de hacerlo bien porque... ya se me quitó
- 8 S2: [y sobre todo porque
- 9 S1: [eso de decir
- 10 S1: ya se me quitó eso de decir parquear
- 11 S1: Ya se me quitó la costumbre de decir parquear cuando...
- 12 S1: voy a decir estacionar...ya lo o sea ya lo pude...
- 13 S3: cambiar...
- 14 S1: cambiar...Superarlo porque sí es cierto

- 15 P: Bueno y ¿por qué lo has cambiado? ¿Quién te dijo que cambiaras?
 16 S1: Nadie, ay pues bueno que desde que empecé a venir a clase aquí (risa)
 17 S1: Dije sí es cierto, estoy mezclando lo que no es
 18 S2: Estoy 'mixteando' (risa)
 19 S1: Me he puesto bien viva, eh porque si es cierto
 20 P: Me encanta como lo explica 'me he puesto bien viva' (risa) y antes,
 21 P: (inaudible)
 22 P: También...Después de leer el artículo de Blanco creo que muchos
 23 P: despertaron, ¿verdad?

- 1 S1: My husband tells me that I have the habit of saying 'taba' instead of
 2 S1: 'estaba'
 3 S1: And he kids me... you're going to be a teacher? Ay (risa)
 4 P1: Yes, and how do you justify this? In your house you use 'taba'
 5 S1: [It's because
 6 S1: I think it's just a habit....and I've promised to pronounce it right
 7 S1: and I have gotten rid of it
 8 S2: [and really because
 9 S1: [it's to say
 10 S1: I've also stopped saying "parquear"
 11 S1: I've stopped saying "parquear" when...
 12 S1: I'm going to say "estacionar" in other words, I could
 13 S2: ...change
 14 S1: change...overcome it because it's true
 15 P1: And why have you changed? Who told you to change?
 16 S1: No one, well I guess since I started coming to this class (laughs)
 17 S1: I said to myself, "it's true, I'm mixing languages"
 18 S2: I am "mixting" (plays with word)
 19 S1: "me he puesto bien viva", because it's true
 20 P: I love how you explain it "me he puesto bien viva" (laughs) and
 20 P: before...(inaudible)
 21 P: Also...After reading Blanco's article I think a lot of you woke up,
 22 P: right?

An example later in the same conversation shows another student's opinion toward learning a more prestigious language variety.

Passage 8

- 1 P: Y entonces Felipe dice, ay quiero cambiar ya no digo parquear y ya no
 2 P: digo este
 3 S1: [ay
 4 P: [groserías

- 5 S2: Recuerden de lo que estaba...estábamos discutiendo o sería hace
 6 S2: mucho de lo que venía en, no me acuerdo, en el libro o algo que dice
 7 S2: que depende del hablante si quiere cambiar si o no, o sea de seguir
 8 S2: igual o...
 9 P: [Depende del hablante , entonces Felipe, ¿Qué dijo? Ya quiero
 10 P: cambiar.
 11 S3: [Ya quiero cambiar
 12 P: [Ya estoy lista...ya quiero ser profesor...
- 1 P: So Felipe says, oh I want to change. I don't say 'parquear' anymore
 2 P: and I don't say, um
 3 S1: [ay
 4 P: [groserías
 5 S2: Remember what I was...we were talking about...
 6 S2: a lot of what came in, I don't remember, in the book or something it
 7 S2: said it depends if the speaker wants to change or not, in other words
 8 S2: stay the same or
 9 P: [It depends on the speaker, so what did Felipe say?
 10 P: I want to change.
 11 S3: [I want to change now
 12 P: [I'm ready...I want to be a teacher.

This passage indicates role switching. The professor uses reported speech to remind the class that previously a student had declared he wanted to speak in Standard Spanish. His reason was instrumental since in becoming a teacher he would be a role model for others. Student 2 has also switched roles, taking the stance of instructor as he reminds the class that a previous reading (Blanco, 2001) stated the speaker decides whether to change dialect usage or not.

Markee (2000) notes that classroom talk often “favors the production of talk of one party at a time” (p. 97). Evidence from the above excerpts indicates that overlapping and interruptions follow an intermediary exchange system, not unlike natural speech turn-taking sequences, yet not devoid of instructional talk. The sequences are not as rigid as teacher-centered classroom talk where only language instruction

predominates. Rather, the teacher encourages meaning-making to occur between the text being studied and students' lived experiences. She asks for personal examples and receives them. The instructor does not make outright 'corrections' to students' speech. Instead, she elicits help from other students, who provide answers regarding general Spanish lexicon (Passage 8, Lines 18-30). Thus, the instructor guides the lesson theme, accentuates certain points she finds relevant to the discussion, and also engages in a level of meta-linguistic discussion.

Students discuss acceptable linguistic behavior within the speech community context. They examine how through social interaction an L1 Spanish speaker finds common ground with others in the community. Also, a narrator lays claim to personal involvement with the relationship between language and experience as she relates a story. Students explore the idea of communicating with others within an informal or a more formal setting. They recognize that professional settings and different circumstances call for different styles and registers. In short, this exercise and others like it provide ample opportunities to explore mixed code usage, connect students with their own speech communities, and bring forth opportunities to increase language repertoire.

4.5.6 “Cartas a Rosa”

Similar to Roca's exercises discussed above, “Cartas a Rosa” (Sánchez, 2003) provided students with the opportunity to use contrastive analysis in written text. The four letters provide a close examination of informality and formality through a continuum of register and style. Open-ended survey questions revealed that the majority

of students believed these letters were beneficial to their learning. In fact, 77% claimed that the letters helped them understand the complexity of being bilingual. Based upon an inductive review of the open-ended responses, the comments were categorized into three groups: (1) linguistic knowledge, (2) speech community recognition and (3) change.

As observed by the responses, “Cartas a Rosa” provided students opportunities to develop their linguistic knowledge in a number of ways. For example, students explored code-switching, verb simplification, and lexical items. They also continued to develop a metalanguage in which they could discuss bidialectal concepts in academic terms. A student in this conceptual category stated, “Las Cartas a Rosa” helped me to understand bilingualism better because I could see how English interfered with Spanish.” Another said, “In “Las Cartas a Rosa” I was able to see the different ways people wrote, which was formal and informal and no matter how informal a letter sounded it was still understandable.”

This new linguistic knowledge led students to connect the text to their own vernacular language. In fact, students commented repeatedly that “Cartas a Rosa” opened their awareness to local dialect use. It was as if the exercise permitted students to explore their own language production more thoroughly. Participants expressed how they had been unaware of using non-standard lexicon prior to completing the reading. One stated, “there were some words that I didn’t know were borrowed words. This exercise had me searching for words to see if they were borrowed.” Another repeated this sentiment when she said, “I found that I use a lot of borrowed words in my everyday speech.” Finally, another student stated, “tuve la oportunidad de analizar y darme cuenta

que existen varios calcos que utilizamos conciente [sic] o inconcientemente [sic] en nuestra habla cotidiana.” (I had the opportunity to analyze and realize that various calques exist that we use consciously or unconsciously in our daily speech.”).

This insight led some students to make value judgments about the vernacular variety, some positive and others negative. One comment accentuates one student’s discomfort as she stated, “There were many code-switching and bad-words that when I read them or have to say one, I think about it twice because for me it does not sound right.” Others found they identified with the reading, recognizing the value in using vernacular code. Once said, “Esto me lleva a pensar que los préstamos del inglés sirven de mucho a la hora de comunicarnos.” (This leads me to think that English loan words serve a purpose when we communicate with each other.) Finally, another student recognized how the lessons learned from this exercise could help her in her teaching career as she chose not to make value judgments based on what she had learned. She explained, “Mi perspectiva como posible maestro es tener una buena base de saber definir la forma correcta e incorrecta del español. Esto no significa que los estudiantes estén obligados a hablar y escribir formalmente, pero sí hacerle notar las diferencias para que poco a poco se vayan acostumbrando al español estándar.” (My perspective as a possible teacher is to have a good base to define correct and incorrect Spanish. This doesn’t mean that students are obligated to speak and write formally, but to have them take note of the differences so that little by little they can become accustomed to the standard Spanish form).

The third group that is categorized for analysis purposes as ‘change,’ highlights

how students were prompted to make changes to their own language production after having completed the exercise. As seen in the previous Roca exercise, this type of comparison and contrast between dialects permits students to explore their own language growth. “Cartas a Rosa” had this same effect since students became more cognizant of their own language application. One student stated, “I applied the new words in a way I can remember. Actually knowing that they are borrowed allows me to search for the proper word. The exercise can be applied to my teaching by identifying the proper terms and borrowed terms and explaining when borrowed terms are allowed and when proper terms are more appropriate.” Another suggested a different means by which to learn these lessons. She explained, “As a teacher of writing, I usually use students’ own drafts to teach tools that they may use later. I find that the lessons are better understood if it has a direct meaning and connected to something they wrote. I have found that context learning, using their writing in whatever subject, is more effective and received well, especially when it is academic writing. Students do not feel attacked nor is the tone condescending, but rather students understand that in academic writing, Standard English or Spanish is more accepted and considered “correct” in the eyes of professors.”

To summarize, both the Roca and Sánchez lessons helped students develop a meta-language by which to discuss bidialectism. Both provided conduits for applying the text to local vernacular, comparing and contrasting different registers and styles. Both engaged students with a detailed exploration of language use in a non-confrontational manner, which led some to want to incorporate academic Spanish into their language repertoire.

4.5.7 Hablar en “F”

Over fifty-two percent (52.6%) of the responded strongly agreed that the “F code” had helped them understand bilingualism more fully. A created code, this language code adds an ‘f’ and vowel between each syllable. An example found on a blog demonstrates its structure, “Pufuesfe yofo sofolofo sefe quefe sefe llafamafa afasífi” (pues yo solo sé que se llama así) (<http://forum.wordreference.com/showthread.php?t=443917>). The professor first used the “F Code” in a classroom to simulate second language learners’ experience of listening to and deciphering an L2. The professor completed the exercise by asking students to provide a written response to the question, “How did you feel during the ‘Hablar en F’ exercise?” Since responses were in written form, a unique opportunity existed to conduct a content analysis. The intent of this exploration was to first capture the ‘manifest’ or experienced content as well as possible “latent’ or hidden content (Holsti, 1969) that could help to clarify the significance of respondents’ answers.

To conduct this content analysis, written responses were first tabulated to determine the number of times that words appeared in the responses. I developed a codebook by identifying the recurring words and phrases, paying particular attention to the single-word synonyms and multiple-word phrases with similar semantic meaning. Through this inductive process, themes were identified and named. The units of analysis were then counted and reported under each category. For purposes of authenticity, student quotes are listed here in their original form, without corrections or additions to orthography. They are then translated into English for purposes of clarity.

The first category identified, which by far received the most prevalent responses, is termed herein as “frustration.” Key words (n= 33) such as “pérdida,” (loss) “intimidación,” (intimidation) and “confusión,” (confusion) exemplify this grouping. Students expressed frustration over incomplete comprehension and their limitations at communicating in the imposed “dialect.” Students felt limited in their ability to understand and respond to the professor; thus, they expressed a loss of personal control. One student stated, “Me senti totalmente fuera de la conversación ya que no entendí nada. Además llega un punto en el que causa frustración porque por más que se trata de figurar no se entiende.” (I felt totally outside of the conversation since I couldn’t understand anything. It also causes frustration because no matter how hard you try, you can’t understand anything.)

Similarly, students stated that in trying to understand this new form of communication, they experienced symptoms of stress, feeling tired and drained. One student commented, “Traté de entender lo que decían pero me confundí y me di por vencida y dejé de escuchar. No me gusta no entender lo que otra gente esta [*sic*] diciendo.” (I tried to understand what they were saying but I got confused and gave up, and stopped listening. I don’t like not understanding what other people are saying). Some even mentioned getting a headache from this effort: “Le dije a mi compañera, “It hurts my brain.” Another said, “Me dolió más la cabeza.” (My head hurt more). These comments express the extent to which students recognized the effort involved in producing a new code.

The second observed category is entitled “empathy.” Having experienced

frustration, some respondents expressed empathy toward second language learners: “Por lo tanto, comprendo que los hablantes de otras lenguas que escuchan hablar a personas de otros idiomas se sientan frustrados. ¡Que [*sí*] desesperación!” (Consequently, I understand that people who speak other languages feel frustrated when they hear others speaking a language they don’t understand. How exasperating!). This was especially telling when a pre-service teacher connected her own affective learning to future students who might experience similar isolation and frustration in the classroom: “Esto me hizo entender a los niños que están en un salón de clase de un idioma diferente por primera vez.” (This made me understand children who are in a class with a different language for the first time).

In contrast, for others ($n = 15$), this exercise elicited fond memories of the game experienced in their own homes. This third theme was categorized as “memories.” Students recalled family members such as parents, siblings, uncles and aunts having used the “F code” as a word game. When positive memories were constructed, students experienced positive reactions and willingly played along, “Yo lo había olvidado un poco pero al escucharlo lo recordé otra vez. Lo hacía cuando era chica.” (I had forgotten it a little but after listening to it, I remembered again. I did it when I was a young girl). Another student said, “Mi mamá y mis tíos me enseñaron.” (My mom and uncles taught it to me). Some respondents expressed cultural pride in understanding the exercise. One said, “Sentí un gran orgullo al volver a escucharlo nuevamente.” (I felt great pride upon hearing it again).

The exercise also prompted the forth category, an understanding of “language

loss” since various respondents commented that as children they had understood the “F code” but had forgotten it as adults. Through experiencing “language loss,” students became cognizant of language shift. Once having left childhood behind, the respondents no longer practiced the code, thus promptly forgot it. One student said, “...pero como nadie habla así, lo deje de practicar.” (...but since no one talks this way, I stopped practicing it). Additionally, students became aware of the laborious cognitive process when faced with relearning a forgotten tongue. One said, “Ahorita entiendo cuando hablan pero tengo que pensar y dividir la palabra para poder hablar con la “F”.” (Now I understand when they speak it, but I have to think and divide the word to speak the “F”).

Within the same “language loss” category, respondents recognized that native speakers could lose their means of communicating. This caused feelings of insecurity because the speaker had lost the ability to communicate in this code: “También creo que intimida porque si en algún momento la persona se dirige a ti y no puedes responder ni si quiera [*sic*] en tu lengua natal ya que no entiendes de que [*sic*] se trata la conversación.” (I also believe it is intimidating because if someone talks to you and you can’t respond even if it’s in your own native tongue, you can’t respond even when it’s in your native tongue because you don’t understand the conversation”). On the other hand, a student recognized that latent knowledge allowed dialect comprehension even when the speaker could not produce the code: “Que [*sic*] interesante saber que si [*sic*] podemos entender nuestro dialecto sin saber que lo estamos haciendo.” (How interesting it is to know that we can understand without knowing we’re using it).

A fifth observed category was “language function,” and this situation referred to

using a secretive language to shut others out. As such, several (n=5) comments made reference to using the code so others would not understand what was being said: “Por lo regular cuando alguien habla en la “F” es para que las demás personas no entiendan.” (Usually when someone speaks in “F” it’s so others won’t understand).

In summary, although many students did not enjoy this exercise because it made them feel uncomfortable, it achieved the purpose the professor had desired: that of having students explore how it felt to be a second language learner and an out-group participant. The categories delineated through student responses of frustration, empathy, memories, language loss and language function describe both in-group and out-group perspectives. For example, some students identified frustration, simply maintaining an out-group perspective, never getting beyond this first experience. Others who experienced frustration, however, turned this confusion into empathy, relating it to others. These individuals made the connection between their own discomfort in not being able to communicate with children whose first language or dialect is not spoken in class. The ‘memories’ and ‘language loss’ categories suggest that this exercise can be used for students to discuss their own feelings of pride and loss. Thus, this exercise is similar to others in that it distinguished between those who had a more complete understanding of general Spanish and of those who did not. Even without purposeful discussions concerning language and power, those who were less able to understand the code expressed feelings of out-group discomfort in “not knowing.” These individuals had less Spanish fluency than the predominantly Spanish-speaking group that had been raised in Mexico for a portion of their life. Finally, the category of ‘functions’ permits

class discussion to explore the rules, obligations, and responsibilities of using a language code.

Consequently, this DA treatment exercise could be used within a critical theory approach as stated by Martínez (2003). When a dialectic expression demonstrates the sense of privilege involved with its use, students can explore the ramifications of language and power. A variation to this exercise would be to create an entirely new code that would allow all classmates to equally experience what it means to not understand classroom discourse. For example, when a third language unknown to all students is introduced through a similar exercise, an equanimical balance would be established to the classroom dynamic. The entire class would then grapple with not understanding a new code and thus equally discuss the sense of frustration, the inability to participate.

4.5.8 “Apodos”

The exercise entitled, “Apodos” by Martínez, (2003), examines the interface between language and power in a critical theoretical perspective. Students are asked to examine the act of assigning nicknames to their classmates and instructor. The instructor facilitates a discursive exploration of ‘naming’ as it relates to asymmetrical relationships. Participants examine the ease with which nicknames are given to political figures or to the downtrodden in society, how a physical feature may become the source of a hurtful “apodo” branding a person for life. They explore the nature of power when multiple dialects interact, recognizing shifting power plays in bilingual domains, who accommodates to the language variety being spoken, or who secedes from the dominant

language group.

For the particular population under study, it has been noted that although Hispanic ethnicity creates homogeneity among the speech community, a breadth of bilingual experiences exists among its members. These are often delineated through socio-economic stratification, geographic place of birth, and residence (i.e. Mexico or U.S. side of border), affiliation with dialect, and previous educational experiences in either private or public schooling. Therefore, I was particularly interested in determining whether students would explore the dynamic layers of identity and the multiple factors of language and power.

Seventy-one percent (71%) strongly agreed that the “Apodos” exercise helped them to understand to a greater degree the significance of being bilingual. However, open-ended survey responses gave little indication as to why students responded favorably. In fact, few mentioned the “Apodos” exercise in the open-ended survey. As a result, the researcher turned to discourse analysis for an inside view of the classroom dynamics.

The following discourse excerpts come from one particular class where the researcher herself engaged in a discussion with the class. Upon first inspection, students in this class did not engage in the exercise because of the negative connotations imbued upon such naming in childhood. This was not the case for all treatment groups; however, this conversation is noteworthy since five students express their discomfort toward completing this exercise, even though the discussion that ensued demonstrated that the exercise had made students think about the relationship between language and

power:

Passage 9

- 1 S1: Yo no lo hice porque por más que estuve pensando, en mi
 2 S1: formación de niña me enseñaron que era de muy mal educación
 3 S1: utilizar los apodos. Entonces, ya tengo eso y ...me cuesta muchísimo
 4 S1: trabajo.... Entonces...pienso mejor en cualidades o características
 5 S1: pero así poner un apodo ni siquiera sé me ocurrió...]
 6 P: [muy bien, ¿otro
 7 P: comentario?
 8 S2: Yo sí lo hice pero yo no pensé a cómo decir como...
 9 S2: como...chaparro...no...yo puse como por ejemplo por decir,
 10 S3: [memo] uh...
 11 S3: [sobrenombres
 12 P: [sobrenombres
 13 S2: sí pero noo.. pensé que]
 14 S4: [tampoco sentí a gusto poner apodos
 15 P: Hay una razón atrás de ese ejercicio que vamos a ver
 16 S1: [me imagino que sí.
 17 S1: Qué no se vaya a ofender a nadie.
 18 S5: Yo no lo hice...bueno lo que yo pienso para poner un apodo tienes que
 19 S5: conocer bien a la otra persona. Para saber sus características y como es
 20 S5: porque no más así vas a ponerle un apodo
 21 P: [Importante eso
 22 S4: (levanta la mano)
 23 P: ¿Sí [S4]?
 24 S4: Yo pensé lo mismo y si no los conozco los voy a insultar...
- 1 S1: I didn't do it because as much as I was thinking about it
 2 S1: when I was a girl they taught me that it was wasn't polite to use
 3 S1: nicknames. So, I have this thing...and it causes me a lot of work....
 4 S1: so I think about a person's qualities or characteristics
 5 S1: but to name someone with a nickname doesn't even occur to me
 6 P: [very good... another comment?
 7 S2: I did it, but I didn't think about using words like
 8 S2: 'shorty.' Instead I used hmmm.
 9 S3: [memo] uh...
 10 S3: [a shortened of a proper name
 11 P: ['sobrenombres'
 12 S2: Yes, but no..... I thought that...]
 13 S4: [I also didn't feel comfortable using nicknames
 14 P: There's a reason behind this exercise that we're going to see.
 15 S1: [I imagine so.

- 16 S1: I hope it doesn't offend anyone.
 17 S5: I didn't do it...well, what I think is that in order to give a person a
 18 S5: nickname you have to know that person well to know his or her
 19 S5: characteristics and what he or she is like
 20 S5: because you can't just give another person a nickname.
 21 P: [This is important
 22 S4: (raises her hand)
 23 P: Yes, [S4]?
 24 S4: I think the same thing. If I don't know them I'm not going to insult
 25 S4: them.

An insistence is noted in that students firmly expressed their sentiment toward not completing the exercise. The professor interrupted the first speaker, presumably to find a different opinion with which to begin the discussion. In line 10 she again tries to lead participants into a discussion on the functions and rules of using nicknames.

However, students were adamant in their expression of discomfort, agreeing with the first speaker's opinion, to not offend the others. The intensifying features (e.g. *may* *mal*) and the direct form used by Speaker 1 indicates her decisive opinion. Her strong lead reinforced other students who agreed with her to continue in this same vein.

Students primarily self selected their entrance into the exchange, although one student raised his hand. Simultaneous speech was the norm in the majority of the exchanges. In line with these observations, we can refer to Reiter who states:

Overlaps and interruptions, for example, can be explained in relation to features of the relationship obtaining between the participants, such as the existence of power asymmetry, where the more powerful participant feels entitled to interrupt the less powerful one; on the other hand, in relation to symmetry and degree of distance (that is, where the participants are equals and are well-acquainted), they might also feel entitled to interrupt to show interest, or simply because they know

in advance what the other person is going to say. (Reiter, 2000, p. 97)

The first overlap may indeed have been assertion of power asymmetry as the professor tried to lead the discussion in a different direction; however, the remaining passage demonstrates a great degree of symmetry with overlapping speech as students answer each other's responses (see lines 5&6, 11&13) and respond to the professor (see lines 19 & 20). This level of high animation set the scene for professor-students talk. The tempo increased as the conversation became more animated and students added their opinions.

A conversational shift occurred, however, when another student explained a different perspective:

Bueno, la familia de mi mamá son unas personas de que al mirar...mirar la gente como que asientan en poner apodos o sea sin conocerlos pero entre nos, entre nos. Parece como...pero no, yo lo miro como a veces sí y a veces no.” [Well, my mother's family are people that just by looking at others or without knowing them can give others nicknames, but just between us, between us. It seems like..but no, I see it like sometimes yes and sometimes no.]

With this shift, which suggested that apodos were used when observing others, several students began considering different contexts in which apodos were used. Through dialogic exchange, the group discussed their understanding of these functions and under what conditions they were used. Student observations included the following:

- Tienes que sentirte a gusto [you have to feel comfortable]
- Tienes que conocer bien a la persona [You need to know the person well]

- La persona que le estás dando el apodo tiene que estar de acuerdo con el apodo [the person you are giving the nickname to has to agree with it]
- Se le pone un apodo al mirar a la gente sin conocerlos
[Nicknames are given to people by watching them without knowing them.]
- Porque te cae mal la persona [because you don't like the person]
- El poder es un apodo [power is in a nickname]

Students began to see the 'variability' (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 10) of using 'apodos' for different reasons and the rationale for using them in different contexts. Variability can be observed as students indicated that on some occasions you must know the person well, while on others, nicknames are created for people who are strangers. Also, in the midst of this discussion, definitions became important as participants began debating the difference between their understanding of 'apodo' and 'sobrenombre'. The discussion continued as follows:

Passage 10

- 1 S1: Yo sé que en español está el sobrenombre y luego el apodo. El
- 2 S1: sobrenombre es...
- 3 S2: [No. Es lo mismo, ¿no?
- 4 S3: [Es lo mismo
- 5 Varios: indecipherable content
- 6 S4: no pero...
- 7 S4: [Sobrenombre y apodo es lo mismo.
- 8 P: ¿Es lo mismo o no es lo mismo?
- 9 S5: El apodo es mucho más fuerte
- 10 S3: Exacto..
- 11 S4: [Sí
- 12 S5: [exacto
- 13 S1: mi nombre es [Guillermo] y me dicen [Memo]

- 14 S5: [Juanita
 15 S1: Un apodo es como chaparra o prieta
 16 S2: [Ándale ese es un apodo
 17 P: ¿[S5]?
 18 S5: Sí un apodo es como chaparra o prieta.
- 1 S1: I know that in Spanish there is a shortened version of a name
 2 S1: and a nickname. A nickname is
 3 S2: [Isn't it the same?
 4 S3: [it's the same
 5 Several speakers: indecipherable content
 6 S4: no but...
 7 S4: [They're the same.
 8 P: Are they the same or not?
 9 S5: A nickname is a lot stronger
 10 S3: Exactly..
 11 Several speakers: [Yes
 12 S5: [exactly
 13 S1: My name is [Guillermo] and they call me [Memo]
 14 S5: [Juanita
 15 S1: A nickname is like 'chaparra' or 'prieta'
 16 S2: [There you go...this is a nickname
 17 P: [S5]?
 18 S5: Yes, a nickname is like 'chaparra' o 'prieta'.

This text indicates that students created their own social understanding of 'sobrenombre' and 'apodo,' defining the connotations of each term through this discursive exchange. The conversation is natural among classmates, not relying on the professor for definitions. Rather students asked each other to clarify their cultural meanings. Note is taken of Student 3, who first stated that "apodo" and "sobrenombre" had the same meaning. However, Student 3 modified her opinion after listening to her classmates' reasoning. Through consensus, then, the group decided that the two terms had different connotations, 'sobrenombre' representing the shortened version of a name while 'apodo' represented a stigmatized form that often represented physical features. This dialectic exchange helped students to create their own understanding of socially

imbued terms.

Participants also presented their own examples of what Fought (2006) terms “self-identification” and “the perceptions and attitudes of others” (p. 6) as they discussed the difference between self-naming and other-naming. The best example came from a student who narrated a personal situation. She explained that friends had given her husband a stigmatized nickname. Every time he heard this nickname, the student’s husband reacted negatively. The narrator explained that she began to use this undesirable nickname as an endearing term when she spoke to her husband. After a time her husband’s attitude changed completely, accepting this ‘apodo’ even when his friends used it. She concluded, “Dice usted, ¿de quién tiene el derecho de poner el apodo. Yo creo que es uno mismo.” [You ask, who has the right to create a nickname for someone? I say that it is oneself.”]

In observing classroom discourse from a functional perspective, it is noted that these above exchanges between professor and students demonstrate a high degree of symmetry. At times the professor guides the conversation with the intention of defining language rules and functions while she simultaneously encourages students to examine the underlying power structures exhibited with language use. Students define and describe terms, clarify their cultural understanding of those terms, and together create a new level of ethnolinguistic identity.

The question remains whether “handover” occurred, “whether students actively took the challenge to generate academic discourse from a classroom discourse that encourages symmetry and equanimity” (see Section 4). I believe that through the

opportunity to discuss power relations in a Spanish language classroom, participants applied their own cultural constructs to the topic of language and power, creating a new understanding of culturally sensitive language. Handover occurred once students owned this exercise, examining it from their worldview. Consequently, the thought-provoking exercise coupled with managed classroom discourse allowed students to challenge their own understandings of the culturally-laden practice of creating nicknames.

Excerpts from focus group comments support the findings of this brief discourse excerpt when they state:

S1: Se pusieron apodos...pero vimos que no es muy fácil ponerle un apodo a una persona o sea que quizás no conozcas muy bien. Es un poco más difícil.

S2:y no es justo por como te ves la apariencia física o por tus limitaciones de una forma te hace sentir mal.

S3: Es que a veces uno nos permitimos que nos pongan un apodo, por decir mi amiga o mi familia, pero no es apropiado y uno no la acepta o nos podemos sentir mal cuando otra persona que muy apenas nos conoce nos pone un apodo.

[Translation] S1: They gave each other nicknames...but we saw that it isn't very easy to give a nickname to someone that you might not know very well. It's a little more difficult.

S2:and it isn't fair based on your physical appearance or your limitations because this makes you feel bad.

S3: It's that sometimes we allow people to give us a nickname, like my friends

or family, but it's not appropriate and you don't accept it or we can feel badly when another person that hardly knows us gives us a nickname.

The above analysis has highlighted sociolinguistic exercises selected from works that were written by HL researchers and professionals in order to examine readily available HL materials that are used across the nation. Understandably, these exercises comprised only a small portion of the entire course. Classroom observations revealed that the professor also infused the classroom conversation with both popular cultural content and Panhispanic literary information. Thus, even though a large amount of classroom conversation dealt with sociolinguistic content emphasizing regional and local vernacular dialects, it also contained a wealth of information about the larger Panhispanic world.

Utilizing dialect awareness as a basic premise, the instructor introduced famous authors, composers, and artists, familiarizing students with well-known Latino personalities and excerpts of their work. She provided examples using Ruben Dario, Octavio Paz, and Jorge Luis Borges. She whetted the interest of students by using musical examples from such diverse Latino figures as Pedro Infante, Los Intocables, Guatemalan popular singer Ricardo Arjona, and jazz artist Tito Puente. The instructor also introduced diverse U.S. Latino writers including Sandra Cisneros, Richard Rodríguez and Julia Álvarez. She made references to Mexican soap operas, popular Latino directors and actors (Luis Valdéz, Salma Hajek, and Jennifer López), and Latino political figures (Henry Bonilla, Judith Zaffirini, and Henry Cuellar). In short, the class was set in a cultural framework that students could immediately relate to as they learned

additional cultural information. The professor connected these role models and famous works to the Spanish language, encouraging students to examine their rich, ethnolinguistic identity throughout class discussions, readings, and writing assignments. Consequently, the holistic approach to dialect awareness is comprised of the three components initially mentioned, sociolinguistic content, Panhispanic cultural content and socio-political content. To understand the interface between ethnolinguistic identity, vernacular language production, and standard language variety, I believe it is important to gather a holistic perspective of the participants involved and their experiences obtained from the learning practice. Therefore, the next section summarizes the focus group conversations held at the end of the dialect awareness treatment.

4.6 Focus Groups

Three focus groups, which were comprised of from four to six treatment group volunteers, informally discussed their language attitudes and classroom experiences after their exposure to dialect awareness. The data from these interviews was used to triangulate the findings obtained from the pre-post treatment surveys. As has been mentioned in the quantitative results, findings showed that several significant changes in attitudes occurred in the treatment group. The discussions below provide qualitative evidence of student reactions to the experience. The interviews present further evidence to either support or indicate alternative views to the quantitative findings concerning the treatment group.

An informal atmosphere pervaded the discussions as all groups answered questions pertaining to three main categories: bilingual/bicultural background, language

attitudes, and teaching and learning classroom practices. The moderator began by asking three general questions:

1. Tell me about your background in relation to language and culture.
2. What language experiences did you have in school?
3. What have you noted about this Spanish class?

With that prompting, participants continued to explore bilingualism in further detail, choosing to discuss aspects of language acquisition they felt were pertinent to the discussion. The analysis consisted of two parts. I first transcribed the three separate focus group interviews, paying particular attention to accuracy. I then analyzed the composite transcriptions with a qualitative content analysis to find salient features in the content. Special attention was paid to analyzing the discourse that described factors that motivated or deterred students from acquiring either Spanish or English. A cumulative analysis then summarized focus group sentiments regarding the dialect awareness treatment that participants had experienced. Since individual narratives are as varied as the individuals involved, this accounting will attempt to show the diverse nature of border bilingualism as expressed by focus group participants while illustrating the consistencies found in their stories.

4.6.1 Physical Border and Language Experience

As noted in Section 3, the term ‘generation’ was difficult to define based on the U.S. Census description of birthplace because border-crossing migratory patterns are so fluid in nature. Thus, the current section provides evidence to the transitory nature and multiple influences that affect language socialization and ethnolinguistic identity at the

border. The term ‘Transborder Crosser’ (Zentella, 2002) becomes useful in defining Borderland experiences. Multiple renditions of transborder patterns can be observed through focus group respondents’ discourse. For example, several individuals were born in Mexico but had been educated in the United States. Other respondents had been born in the United States but had returned to Mexico to live with family. ‘Transborder crosser’ helps to define and explain these focus group experiences within the different spheres of influence that have affected language development, ‘age of onset’ (Montrul, 2005), and attitudes toward bilingualism.

To analyze this perspective, focus group discussants first shared their personal stories as they related to geographical proximity, migratory experiences, and social networking patterns. Some stories depicted stable situations, with narrators living for years in the same location, experiencing language socialization in a stable, bilingual environment. Others were of a transitory nature, with narrators repeatedly relocating from one side of the border to the other. Such experiences affected these university students’ language attitudes differently. For example, participants who experienced the stability of living in the United States commonly recalled encountering English for the first time in the school system. One respondent perfunctorily stated, “En Pre-K (pronounced in English) empecé con inglés.” (“In Pre-K I started learning English.”). However, most had vivid recollections of their first encounter with English.

One discussant experienced a particularly difficult situation when she moved at age 13 with her family to a northern city in Texas. She had mistakenly been placed into Special Education classes because school officials had misdiagnosed her language

abilities. She explained,

al principio fue una experiencia...digamos que difícil porque por un error de la escuela por decidir de una persona me pusieron en clases...eh...todas en inglés. Y estaban hablando y no entendía absolutamente nada. Sabía llegar a los salones pero no sabía lo que estaban hablando, si no es que alguien se aprendió de mí como al mes probablemente...me pusieron en clases bilingües...y fue cuando empecé ...

[Translation] At first it was an experience...let's say difficult, because due to a school error, in other words a certain person put me in classes....all in English. And they were talking and I didn't understand anything. I knew how to get to the classrooms, but I didn't know what they were saying until someone learned about me probably about a month later. They put me in bilingual classes...This was when I started [to learn English].

Other transborder crossers experienced a southern migration, returning to Mexico after having lived for some time in the United States. In one particular instance, a respondent explained that her family had returned to Mexico because her parents had wanted their children to be educated in Spanish. However, because this sequential bilingual was the youngest, she experienced language much differently than her siblings, whose education had been primarily in English. As a result, this sequential bilingual who learned academic English at age 18 when she began her university studies, spoke Spanish in the majority of her daily interactions. The borderland environment facilitated this choice.

Borderland dwellers were often highly influenced by both sides of the border. In some cases, respondents lived for periods of time on either side. Commonly, respondents who lived in Mexico crossed the border daily to study at the University. For example, one transborder crosser had lived in Mexico, learned English in a private U.S. school, and returned home to the social network that relied primarily on monolingual Spanish.

This respondent described the significance that the physical border had for her discursive patterns. She stated,

Me acuerdo que venimos caminando porque iba a la escuela ...y mi papá me recogía ahí y me dejaban...íbamos a comprar algo en McDonalds...siempre era McDonalds, y ahí nos quedamos de ver todos mis primos. Y ellos cruzaban conmigo el puente y cuando veníamos caminando al lado Americano hablábamos en inglés. Pero nada más sabíamos que estábamos e..al lado mexicano y hablábamos en español.

[Translation] I remember that we would come walking because we'd go to school...and my dad would pick me up there and they would leave me...we would buy something at McDonalds...it was always McDonalds. And we would agree to meet my cousins there. And they would cross the bridge with me, and when we would be walking on the American side, we'd speak in English. But just as soon as we were on the Mexican side, we'd speak in Spanish.

When speaking of traversing the border, respondents discussed their constant crossing from one side to the other as “voy al otro lado” (I'm going to the other side) or

“vivíamos de este lado” (We used to live on this side). These phrases were just as commonly used among focus group participants who lived in the United States as they were for those living in Mexico. Yet unlike border dwellers who lived in Mexico, English dominant border dwellers experienced the border differently. Commonly, these borderland dwellers who had been primarily socialized to speak Spanish in the home and English in public domains, experienced border crossing as a social event. Close family networks were maintained through Spanish as a social language.

U.S. dwellers commonly experienced English and Spanish in different domains. Spanish or a combination of Spanish and English were primary home languages while English predominated in the public realm. Typically parents were a primary Spanish language source. In some situations, one parent spoke only Spanish. In other situations, both parents were Spanish dominant. One respondent stated, “Hablaba solamente español con mi mamá” (“I spoke only Spanish with my mom”). Others recognized they had learned a combination of both languages. One student explained,

Mi mamá habla español pero te habla unas cosas en inglés pero no las dice bien. Claro porque no...nunca estudió inglés pero con nosotros aprendió unas cuantas palabritas y le habla también como ella hacía, en español-inglés y yo también habla asina. So dice pues dice una oración en inglés y luego dice una palabra en español o dice unas oraciones una parte de la oración en español y dice una palabra que no sabe en inglés.

[Translation] My mom speaks Spanish but she says some things in English but she doesn't say them well. Obviously because she didn't study English, but with

us she learned a few words, and she talks in Spanish-English, and I speak that way too. So she'll say a sentence in English and then a word in Spanish, and then she'll say a word in Spanish and some sentences or parts of sentences in Spanish, and she'll say a word she doesn't know in English.

Most simultaneous language bilinguals remembered that both languages were heard frequently from different family and friends. One suggested that early friendships helped her language development, “yo como quiera aprendí entre las amiguitas.” (“In any case I learned with my young friends.”). Television programs were also used to help respondents learn a language. One student stated, “Yo aprendí inglés como a los cuatro cinco años en kinder...hmmm...y luego luego...se me hace porque oía mucho la televisión (risa)...se me hace por eso entendía mucho el inglés. Con el Disney Channel.” (I learned English at about age five in kindergarten. And quickly...I think because I watched a lot of TV (laughter), that's why I think I understood a lot of English. With the Disney Channel...”)

Consequently, respondents acquired both languages to varying degrees prior to schooling. Exposure depended upon familial relationships, early friendships, early educational programs, public domains, and media such as television. School became the domain where Spanish, English and/or mixed code were used with friends. In the classroom English became the primary language.

4.6.2 Higher Education Language Experiences

High school years were a time when Spanish was perfunctorily recognized as a ‘second language’ through mandatory language classes. One student stated, “Nunca

tuve español hasta en High School pero nunca hicimos nada de español” (risa ligera). (I never had any Spanish classes until High School but we never did anything in Spanish” (light laughter). The greatest language impact for most heritage language learners was at the university level, when academic language became important in both languages. This was often termed a moment of reckoning for those who were unsure of either of one of their languages. Much the same sentiment was expressed by both Spanish and English dominant bilinguals. Recognizing that academic life required a more complex level of both English and Spanish, some found the challenge difficult. A focus group discussant stated,

Con una maestra tuve una muy mala experiencia y entré a esta clase pensando, “okay, no tengo un español así tan académico pero no tan mocho, o así sé me defender porque pos mis papás no son cualquier persona...son estudiados y ellos nos enseñaban y de hecho mi mamá me enseñó a leer y escribir en español...y me la pasaba con las revistas y con los umm comics los de Lolis la gordis mi mamá los guardó los guardó y nos ponía a leer eso.

[Translation] With one teacher I had a bad experience and I entered class thinking, ‘okay, I don’t have an academic Spanish but not so bad either, and I can defend myself because my parents aren’t just anyone. They have schooling and they taught us. In fact, my mom taught me how to read and write in Spanish...and I spent time reading the comics of ‘Lola’. My mom kept them and she’d have us read this.

This student was secure in knowing that she had literacy skills that she had

learned at home with her mother who had dedicated time to maintaining Spanish for her children.

A Spanish dominant student stated similar sentiments when speaking of academic English. She explained,

Un professor que hablaba muy académicamente usaba unas palabrotas que nadien de la clase sabía todos se quedaban como...que está diciendo...en inglés...Decía, “es que tienen que saber como hablar asina.” We had to speak academically or learn how to speak academically, pero no nos explicaba no mas hablaba. No explicaba lo que significaba hasta que alguien le preguntó que es esa palabra...he was codeswitching with academic words (risa).

[Translation] One professor that spoke very academically used big words that no one in class understood...everyone just wondered what he was saying...in English...He said, “you need to know how to speak this way.” We had to speak academically, but he didn’t explain how - he just talked. He didn’t explain what it meant until someone would ask what a word meant...he was codeswitching with academic words. – (laughter)

The dialect awareness classroom experience encouraged students to revisit these formative language experiences. Students openly expressed their opinions about learning a language. For example, second and third generation HL students whose dominant language was English provided insight into previous Spanish learning experiences. One stated, “...en otras clases que he tomado, que hay reglas, reglas y más reglas. ‘Que no hables así.’ Te corregían, o te daban puros exámenes de reglas.” (“in

other classes that I've taken, there are rules, rules and more rules. 'Don't talk like that.' They would correct you or just give you exams about rules.''). Another expressed how difficult it was to speak an academic register. She explained, "pues, empecé a tomar más clases de español, pero se me hicieron muy difíciles todavía académicamente." ("Well, I started taking my Spanish classes, but they were still very difficult for me academically.")

Language was decidedly a defining feature of discussants' identity as borderland dwellers and transborder crossers. They recognized the importance of conversing across different social spheres, using vernacular language to communicate and showing tolerance for diverse bilinguals. At the same time, focus group participants recognized the importance of speaking a standard language, commenting that the home sphere had been a primary influence in their language socialization. For example, several respondents recalled being told to speak only Spanish at home or to not mix languages. They were told that "gente educada" would not mix languages or that they should respect those who spoke only Spanish. One student said, "mi abuelito ...es respeto porque yo no les entiendo a ustedes los que están diciendo en inglés." ("My grandfather...it's respect because 'I don't understand you what you are saying in English.'). Another discussed the need to be bilingual and biliterate, especially since as future teachers they were to be language role models; "La maestra tiene que ser el modelo. Tiene que poner el ejemplo." ("The teacher has to be the model. She has to give the example.").

These examples demonstrate at once the diversity in language attitudes and the

similarity in language experiences of the Borderland. Varying degrees of bilingualism in a border community facilitate communication across a breadth of bilingual abilities. Bilingual interactants accommodate to various discursive practices in both public and private domains. Although focus group participants recognize the value of learning a Standard Spanish, which connects the borderlands to a larger sphere of influence, vernacular language will not be replaced by Standard Spanish due to the complex nature of the Borderlands.

The following section will describe focus group comments toward DA treatment.

4.6.3 Dialect Awareness Exercises

Focus group comments toward the dialect awareness exercises were very positive. It is recognized that participants may have accommodated to the interviewer's expectations, thus verbalizing a high degree of positive remarks. However, the openness with which students spoke, expressed their desire to discuss their language experiences and the perspective they had obtained on language learning, led the researcher to believe the authenticity of their remarks. Comments suggest three categories that will be discussed herein: (1) class highlights, (2) confidence level, and (3) future teaching strategies.

Class highlights included the different lessons students had covered in class that had made a particular impact on them. Of the five exercises highlighted herein, 'Cartas a Rosa' was mentioned more often than others as having helped students understand the significance and usage of different dialects. However, other lessons were mentioned as well. In particular, a lesson on direct and indirect speech acts had made an impact on

one set of students. One student recalled,

También los actos de habla, de cómo en el español en particular estamos tan acostumbrados, por ejemplo de enviar mensajes de forma indirectas...que no lo dices claramente pero te supone que él te entendió. Como ya se acostumbra, el mandato, el pedido, o sea las forman con la intonación que utilizas como una frase pueden enviar muchos significados dependiendo de cómo la hablas.

[Translation] Also speech acts, how in Spanish in particular we are used to, for example, sending indirect messages. You don't say it clearly but expect the other person to understand you. Since you're used to this, the command form, the request, are formed by the intonation that you use. A phrase can send many meanings depending upon how you say it.

Confidence level was clearly a common thread throughout student comments. General consensus demonstrated that a level of trust developed in class, attributable to both access to knowledge and teacher-student affect. Access to knowledge was gained through sociolinguistic concepts. Students recognized this link to their own language production. One said, "Como la clase se trata de esto, de lingüística, todos los fenómenos los vivimos." ("Since the class is about this, linguistics, we live all the phenomena studied"). Moreover, students expressed their relationship between language use and the professor's reaction to this use. If students inadvertently mixed codes while speaking, they would recognize the non-standard code but did not feel ostracized for having used it. One student explained, "No te hace sentir mal. No te sientes frustrada o paniqueada...que tienes que hacer esto bien, correcto, académicamente sino te lo

transmite de una manera pacíficamente pero académicamente a la vez.” (“She doesn’t make you feel badly. You don’t feel frustrated or panicked...that you have to do it well, correct, academic, but she transmits it in a pacific but academic manner at the same time”). Another expressed the same sentiment when she stated, “No te sentías mal. Antes te diste cuenta, ‘ah, mezclé con inglés’, sino que dices, ‘hay algo diferente’.” (“You didn’t feel badly. Before you knew it, ‘ah I mixed English’ now you say, ‘there’s a different way’”). This last comment emphasized that not only did the instructional format permit a level of confidence to develop but it also provided an option to learn the academic form. A number of students expressed the desire to learn a prestige language variety. One stated,

Pasando el semestre te das cuenta, ‘ay, no se dice bil se dice billete, o ay, eso no es troca es camioneta. Y por la confianza te inspira a tú solito te estás cambiando. No porque te está forzando hacerlo y ni es una autoridad rígida ante a nosotros, más bien es una amiga que te está ayudándote hablar de la manera correcta, apropiada.

[Translation] As the semester goes by you realize, ‘Oh, you don’t say ‘bil’ you say ‘billete.’ Or you don’t say ‘troca’ you say ‘camioneta’. And because of the confidence she inspires in you, you change yourself. Not because she’s forcing you to do it. Neither is she a rigid authority in front of us. Better yet she’s a friend that’s helping us to speak in a correct or appropriate way.

Being teachers in training, students observed lessons they would take into their own future instructional practices. One student mentioned how the treatment instruction

helped students to remember new ways of speaking. She said, “La enseñanza como en esta clase es muy repetitiva, o sea, lo estaba variando pero al final del punto o a la mitad del punto repetía...repetición de la vez pasada.” (“The instruction in this class is very repetitive. In other words, she varied it but in the end or the middle she would put in a repetitive point...some repetition from the last class”). Another commented that she could now understand the vernacular Spanish better, which in turn would help her in a future teaching role, “Esta clase nos va a ayudar cuando estamos en el salón de clase cuando los estudiantes entran con un dialecto no estandar...vamos a poder entenderlo y poder guiarlos a que hablen el estandar.” (This class is going to help us when we’re in the classroom when students speak in a non-standard dialect we’ll be able to understand them and help them to speak a standard”).

In summary, through dialogic exchange, participants discussed their reflections of life on the border. Students had clearly been engaged with the DA content as evidenced by their recall of lessons and classroom discussions. Codeswitching was a topic of interest, especially as it related to morphological adaptations. In particular, students commented about the lexical items they had found that were common to the vernacular variety but considered nonstandard in other geographic locations. Participants commented that they could recall false cognates and archaisms more easily after the DA treatment experience. It is important to note, however, that little was mentioned regarding simplification of the verbal system (Potowski, 2002), the shift in the use of ‘ser’ and ‘estar’ (Silva-Corvalán, 1994) or the simplified subjunctive (Zabaleta, 2000). It is suggested that either these topics were not covered in class or

they did not make a noticeable impact upon the interviewees.

The most striking comments were related to attitudinal changes toward other HL speakers and the acceptance of mixed-code usage under certain situations. Students had clearly applied the “doctrine of appropriateness” (Seigel, 2006). They acknowledged that it would be considered rude in some situations to use Standard Spanish when other interlocutors were using vernacular code. They also recognized the importance in using Standard Spanish when applicable and in perfecting their Spanish language skills. Moreover, some participants acknowledged their change in attitude toward simultaneous bilinguals, saying that by understanding the bilingual continuum, they were more empathetic toward other bilinguals.

Other participants recognized the importance in defining when to use particular codes. For example, several teachers in training discussed the complexity of specifying appropriateness to future students. They were concerned that modeling a Standard Spanish was not an easy task in the borderland region since U.S. Border Spanish was used so prevalently. Interviewees discussed strategies and techniques that they might develop to explain these concepts in a classroom setting.

These qualitative findings triangulate with the quantitative finding that indicated significant attitudinal changes had occurred toward other HL speakers and the vernacular variety after one semester of dialect awareness. The theoretical perspective of bidialectism as espoused by many sociolinguists (Silva-Corvalán, 2001; Zentella, 1997) had clearly been imbued into the teaching practices. The next section will conclude with a discussion of these findings and recommendations for future research.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary of Study

Kondo-Brown (2010) recently called for an HL research agenda to examine the efficacy of curricular and instructional approaches that help HL learners’ “to understand and critically analyze the standard and nonstandard varieties of the HLS” (34). This study responds to such a call by analyzing dialect awareness as a Spanish Heritage Language teaching and learning practice through both quantitative inquiry and qualitative description. To summarize, dialect awareness as applied to this study included three components: sociolinguistic content, Panhispanic cultural content, and social-political content. Sociolinguistic content incorporated such topics as language contact, language variability, registers and regional dialects. Panhispanic cultural content comprised an overview of Hispanophone literature, fine arts, and film. It also incorporated regional and local popular culture known to HL learners. Socio-political content spanned a critical perspective, discussing the historical context in which language variety occurs, addressing issues of power, prestige and stigma. This applied linguistics study examined the three DA components as a holistic HL instructional methodology to determine if student attitudes toward learning Spanish and ethnolinguistic identity changed throughout the learning process.

Two research questions began this study: Does dialect awareness increase HL student confidence in learning a prestige language variety? Does dialect awareness treatment impact student attitudes toward Spanish vernacular varieties?

To answer these questions, I used a mixed-methodology, gathering both quantitative and qualitative data from a classroom environment. The dialect awareness treatment group consisting of forty-nine (49) students took semester-long HL Spanish courses. The majority of these students had self-identified as either pre-service Spanish or bilingual teachers in training. The population first responded to an on-line questionnaire, which gathered demographic, ethnolinguistic, and attitudinal information. The surveys were submitted to a quantitative data analysis, using Chi-square to examine students' perceived Spanish language skills, language confidence, and language attitudes.

In addition, qualitative data was obtained through open-ended survey questions, 30-hours of classroom observation, and focus group interviews to triangulate with quantitative findings. Open-ended questions captured respondents' perspectives of different HL exercises found in Spanish textbooks. I utilized classroom discourse analysis to document the interplay between language, specific dialect awareness exercises, and students' expressions of ethnolinguistic identity. Focus group interviews provided further data by which to triangulate the qualitative results.

Upon first analysis, quantitative results found that dialect awareness had no statistically significant effect on students' self-reported confidence levels when speaking the prestige language variety (RQ1). It may be the case that an increase was not significantly discernable because respondents had rated their language skills high from the onset. An interesting pattern that may relate to this finding was observed in the background information. As was noted above, participants reported a high amount of

Spanish language contact in both the private and public domains, stating that they spoke Spanish in formal settings with a relatively high level of confidence. These settings referred to public domains such as school and work. Recognizing the amount of bilingualism in the Borderlands, this finding is not surprising. Yet, it brings to light the need to further investigate public domains for their role in language maintenance. Even when language contact decreases in the home domain, language contact in the Borderlands' public arena may to some degree offset language loss in the home.

Apart from the above finding, quantitative results did not establish conclusive evidence regarding student confidence in language skills. However, formative assessment tools and qualitative analysis gleaned from treatment group discourse, open-ended survey questions, and focus group discussions clearly demonstrated that DA recipients had developed analytical skills that led to their identifying bilingual speech phenomena such as archaisms, nonce borrowings, and false cognates in the vernacular variety, distinguishing the vernacular from Standard Spanish. Open-ended survey responses supported this observation, especially when students' described specific exercises used in class.

Proof to this effect was also documented through focus group discussions in which participants elaborated upon their newly acquired knowledge of dialect awareness. Respondents repeatedly confirmed that in particular, bidialectal contrastive analysis helped them to identify and use both the standard and vernacular varieties in different contexts and domains. Such qualitative results are in line with previous research claims, which have found that sociolinguistic content promotes the

development of a standard language variety (Feigenbaum, 1970; Fogel & Ehri, 2000; Simard & Wong, 2004; Svalberg, 2007; Wheeler & Swords, 2006; Yiakoumetti, Evans & Esch, 2005; and Young and Helot, 2003). Nevertheless, based upon the disparate findings, no conclusive statement regarding student confidence levels toward learning a prestige language variety (RQ1) can be made from this study.

In contrast, results did find significant indications to support Research Question 2 (RQ2), “Does dialect awareness treatment impact student attitudes toward Spanish vernacular varieties?” Both quantitative and qualitative results showed significant changes in student attitudes toward bilingualism in general and the specific vernacular variety, U.S. Border Spanish. After one semester of dialect awareness the study’s population (1) developed an awareness of personally using mixed code, (2) recognized numerous reasons for its use, and (3) understood the appropriateness of using mixed code in certain situations and domains. Respondents had clearly gained a more positive attitude toward both bilingualism and vernacular speech style. By developing a meta-language about bilingualism and language varieties, DA recipients demonstrated an understanding of the numerous influences that impact HL speakers. They recognized the importance of speaking different registers and styles of Spanish depending upon the context and domain. In particular, respondents recognized that the exercises used in class both broadened their understanding of other U.S. Spanish-speaking populations and they also validated ethnolinguistic identity lived on the borderlands. Exercises that prompted these responses included work from Koike & Klee (1994); Martínez (2003), Roca (2005); Sánchez, (2003), the “F” code (Martínez, 2003) and an exercise adapted

from Azevedo (1992). Such evidence supports previous claims that sociolinguistic content validates HL learner ethnolinguistic identity (Martínez, 2003; Parodi, 2008; Silva-Corvalán, 2001; Valdés, 1997; and Webb & Miller, 2000). This finding is also consistent with previous empirical research (Oh & Au, 2005), which has shown a correlation between Standard Spanish mastery and strong identification with the home culture.

The final finding that resulted from this study showed that by the end of the semester-long course, DA students had demonstrated an increased sense of affect as expressed through more empathetic comments regarding both their own and other HL speakers' language production. This finding concurs with Andrews (2006), Svalberg (2007), and Young and Helot (2003), who claim that language awareness instruction prompts attitudinal changes toward speakers of non-standard language varieties. In the current study, students from different ends of the bilingual continuum confirmed this phenomenon. For example, a Spanish dominant speaker stated, "La clase nos convenció a unos para entender a los que su primer idioma es el inglés y a los que su primer idioma es el inglés a que se animaran hablar en español. Incluso en clase hay una compañera que es muy tímida y en ninguna otra clase se atrevía a participar. Aquí lo hizo. [The class convinced native Spanish speakers to understand those who first language is English. It also encouraged native English speakers to speak in Spanish. In fact, one classmate who is very timid and doesn't speak up in other classes dared to participate in this one]." Likewise, an English dominant speaker said, "It helped me to be more open-minded and well-educated on what being a resident along the border really means."

Comments such as these clearly support previous heritage language research (Parodi, 2008; Potowski and Carreira, 2004; Romero, 2000), which repeatedly states that HL instruction should infuse a strong sense of affect into classroom practices.

5.2 Limitations

The above findings lend credibility to the use of dialect awareness as an instructional practice, and future empirical studies should examine its significance in different universities. Results have found that students develop an increased ability to value a vernacular language variety and to discern language variety differences. Findings also show that participants have developed a heightened awareness and sensitivity toward their own and other bilingual speakers' language production. However, quantitative findings indicated that Spanish language confidence levels in the skill areas remained exhibited no statistically significant change. In this framework, several limitations will be discussed.

Recognizably, the non-random sample was relatively small in size. Limitations existed in both the selection process and with the class size. For instance, due to academic requirements stipulated in degree plans, students were required to register for specific courses and thus could not be randomly selected for a study such as this one. In addition, at the time of this study, class size was relatively small due to the limited number of students who registered in this regional university's Spanish program. Consequently, the need to rely on a small, non-random sample of heritage language students was a limitation.

The project design also had specific limitations that became evident as the

project developed. First, a limitation existed with the survey instrument since it did not ask students for their major of study. It became more apparent throughout the study that this information would have been beneficial since students either sought a degree in Spanish, including an emphasis in literature, or a certification in Bilingual Education. It is now evident to the researcher that language skills and attitudes may differ based upon students' intended professional goals.

Another limitation existed with limited access to course assessments. Formative assessments were conducted to further describe collaborative learning processes that had occurred in the classroom. This did provide substantive evidence to students' reactions to dialect awareness and to language use. However, summative assessments that could have compared scores from standardized tests such as the national COMPASS exam were not employed. Future studies could use such summative measurements to assess the impact that dialect awareness has on Heritage Language development.

Finally, although this research used a mixed-method to examine dialect awareness in the classroom, as the study evolved, it became apparent that it was much stronger in its qualitative examination of classroom practices than in the quantitative design. The survey was effective in providing demographic information and feedback about dialect awareness from the open-ended questions. However, it was not as effective when used to measure pre-post differences. Future quantitative studies could further examine DA instructional practices by comparing treatment and control group classrooms to advance replicable studies.

In spite of these limitations, this study provided an examination of the rich,

discursive classroom practices that occurred when a dialect awareness approach was implemented. Consequently, I recognize that classroom discourse is important when furthering the knowledge base of how ethnolinguistic identity and language instruction interface. Furthermore, I believe it is important to continue using both quantitative and qualitative research designs to examine students' ethnolinguistic identity as they study their heritage language(s).

5.3 Discussion and Conclusion

Valdés, Fishman, Chávez & Pérez (2006) have noted that a discrepancy exists between the content commonly covered in university HL Spanish courses and the recommendations made by Spanish-speaking professionals in diverse careers. While courses typically emphasize a standard dialect, degreed professionals underscore the need for Spanish language maintenance and the development of specialized vocabulary in students' chosen fields (p. 209). In other words, professionals recognize that from a career perspective, pre-professionals need the "historical and cultural connections" as well as instrumental skills to excel in the global marketplace. I contend that these two seemingly different sets of desired outcomes identified by Valdés, Fishman, Chávez & Pérez are not mutually separate. Rather, it is critical to infuse the Spanish curriculum with an appreciation of the historical, cultural, and political contexts that have shaped vernacular Spanish varieties, create connections between students' lived experiences and instrumental aspirations, and provide opportunities for the acquisition of formal and academic registers.

The implications of this study suggest that Spanish Heritage Language dialect

awareness should become a component of teaching and learning practices in the HL classroom. Since few studies have been conducted regarding HL student attitudes in a bidialectal classroom, this research can be a catalyst for future investigations. The intent is to create optimal learning environments where students can make connections between their understandings of language and culture and the larger field of Panhispanicism. Such a goal requires much more than a traditional classroom approach. Rather, it requires a holistic learning environment in which students can develop interconnections between different Spanish language varieties, worldviews, and ethnolinguistic expression. This study has identified that a process-oriented classroom environment, discursive communication style, and dialect awareness content can provide a means for students to explore their sense of identity void of prescriptivist judgment.

To further explore dialect awareness as a classroom-based approach, a research agenda should include studies that connect DA to experiential learning, technological practices, contrastive analysis of different genres, and creative writing. Experiential learning projects should be examined to determine whether or not they can help students develop integrative language skills that promote practical application and instrumental linkages. For example, students could design special work-setting projects that facilitate their learning of specialized communication skills in a professional venue. Undergraduate research projects could also explore the socio-political ramifications of language policies, the increasing Hispanic presence in the media and business, or language contact and change within U.S. immigrant populations. Such projects link students' ethnolinguistic identity to the very topics they are studying, the diverse nature

of U.S. Spanish, the value of developing a standard language variety, and the acknowledgment of standard language varieties within communities of practice.

The technological age also provides many opportunities for HL classrooms to connect with the larger Panhispanic world. For example, Spanish professors who typically have contacts with colleagues in other Spanish-speaking countries can create virtual conversations simply by using the technology available on college campuses. These ties establish relationships that promote Spanish language exchange through chat rooms, blogs, discussion boards, and social networks. Such opportunities open different ways of exploring worldviews, cultures, and language varieties across political and national boundaries. For example, students could be exposed to the diversity of ethnolinguistic identities with other speech communities across the nation by engaging in chats with diverse Latino populations. These and other integrative practices should be researched as they apply to dialect awareness to examine the benefits that such connections have for HL students.

In addition to these suggestions, I propose that Panhispanic perspectives be examined through artistic, cultural, and literary genres to form an integral part of this dialect awareness experience. Research into English bidialectal studies provide examples of what Rickford and Rickford (2007) call the Versatility Approach. These authors move beyond traditional contrastive drill-type exercises to explore bidialectism through literature, music, and other cultural products. They provide examples of contrastive analysis using poetic works from James Weldon Johnson, Paul Laurence Dunbar and Nina Simone. The authors explore how students benefit by using poetic

forms to contrast different grammatical features of AAVE and Standard English, and to explore attitudes toward dialect poetry and Standard English poems. Similar contrastive analysis could be made in HL Spanish classes with both historical and contemporary literature.

Creative writing should also be explored and researched as an integrative learning process applied to dialect awareness. A technique that I observed, which was used outside of the parameters of this study, included a poetry-writing assignment adapted from Guitart (2007). This process-oriented writing assignment led students to write a one-line poem after having explored both concrete and abstract language. The instructor guided students to develop a one-sentence poem that was relevant to their own lives. During the process students expressed their concern that they were not ‘good enough’ or ‘creative enough’ to write a poem. However, through an ethnolinguistic perspective, the professor who remains anonymous in this study encouraged students by explaining, “poetry can be about anything – a wrestler, a migrant worker, a dear grandmother or the river that unites our sister cities. [Students] are able to write about any subject, any theme, in any voice.” Thus, students began line-by-line to devise their poetic creations.

Students responded so positively to this experience that it became more than simply a class exercise. When a special, campus-wide event for Latin American Studies Week was being planned, a collaborative idea developed between the Spanish professor and a photography professor whose students had captured photographic images of life on the border. The result was a photo/poetry writing exhibition entitled, “Escritura con

luz.” Spanish class students selected a photographic image that depicted some aspect of border life and proceeded to use their “Alternatives to Easy Poetry” exercise to write a poem about border life, tying the visual image to written word. Both classes joined to curate the exhibition under the tutelage of the photography professor. The result was a student-run and produced artistic exhibit that depicted life along the border, reflecting ethnolinguistic border identity by using the Spanish language. These types of integrative projects should be explored for their pedagogical value in heritage language contexts.

Integrative sociolinguistic content and cultural knowledge can be presented in numerous ways to create a holistic learning approach. One aspect that was not fully explored in this study and deserves attention is the examination of socio-historical dimensions of Spanish (Balestra, Martínez, & Moyna, 2008). Historical linguistic research of regional importance could provide a rich resource for contrastive analysis in the HL classroom. An example is found in the forthcoming work of Hickey (unpublished), who analyzes Spanish language use in personal letters of correspondence written between 1860 and 1930 in Southwest Texas. I suggest that HL students would relate to this work since it documents borderland language use and provides a historical linguistic analysis of personal letters. Students would gain insight into archaic usages, language change, and a variety of language styles from a borderlands perspective.

A methodological construct that was not developed in the classrooms under study but recommended for further consideration is discourse analysis. I suggest HL learners could learn basic application of discourse analysis so they may explore their speech community to examine language in use. Real discourse from the community provides

examples of authentic speech, bringing the community into the classroom. For example, in previous classes I have encouraged students to use the bilingual public environment as a sociolinguistic field. In one situation, I instructed learners to listen intently to brief dialogues heard between two people, record them, and write a brief reflection. These were subsequently used as fodder for classroom discussion. Students were asked to simply record excerpts without making judgment calls about correctness or appropriateness. Two examples written in students' language are provided below:

Example 1: La siguiente conversación ocurrió en la biblioteca de una escuela secundaria. Esta conversación fue entre un estudiante del octavo grado y la bibliotecaria. [The next conversation occurred in a middle school

library. This conversation was between an 8th grade student and a librarian.]

Estudiante: ¿Mrs. X, puedo check out un video o nomas puros books? [Mrs. X, can I check out a video or just books?]

Bibliotecaria: Puedes checar books, videos, audio books, magazines, anything you want. [You can check out...]

Estudiante: All right...Y si hago check out una movie, when do I have to bring them back? [All right. And if I check out a movie? When do I have to bring it back?]

Bibliotecaria: Tomorrow, videos are due the next day. No quiere que los pierdan and besides there are more students wanting to take it, mijito. [Tomorrow.

Videos are due the next day. You don't want them to get

lost and besides, there are more students who want to take it, my dear.]

Estudiante: Bueno then I'm checking out a book and a video. [Okay then, I'm checking out a book and a video.]

Bibliotecaria: Okay, me dices cuando estés listo sweetie. Okay. Tell me when you're ready sweetie.

Explicación: Por la manera de conversar entre una figura que representa un cierto grado de autoridad en la escuela, el estudiante se siente cómodo al hacer uso de cambio de código sin problema y de una manera muy natural. Existe, sin embargo cierto grado de lealtad al grupo de amigos con los que se encuentra hablando español solamente. Aunque empieza usando algunas frases en inglés, la bibliotecaria le responde con palabras en español y haciendo cambio de código de una manera tan natural como la de su estudiante. Este acto aporta seguridad al estudiante y así demuestra lealtad hacia su grupo de habla que constituye en este caso en un grupo pequeño de amigos.

[Explanation: Shown by the way of speaking with an authority figure at school, the student feels comfortable using codeswitching in a very natural way.

However, the speaker shows a certain amount of loyalty towards the group of friends that are speaking exclusively in Spanish. Although he starts to use some words in English, the librarian answers with words in Spanish and using codeswitching as naturally as the student. This act gives the student confidence and demonstrates loyalty toward the speech group, which in this case constitutes a small group of friends.]

Example 2: Person A switches between languages frequently. She seems to have ample knowledge of both languages, and can choose between ideas expressed in either English or Spanish while composing her spoken phrases. While observing Person A, I notice that she is doing this almost unconsciously, that is to say, by the speed with which she converses it is obvious she is not code-switching for borrowing purposes. The conversation she is in carries predominantly in Spanish with a sprinkle of English words or thoughts.

Person B on the contrary, does very little code-switching. He is predominantly leading the conversation in Spanish. His speech seems to be slower paced than Person A's. He uses English to translate or explain some ideas, but other than that, his speech continues to remain steadily in Spanish. The conversation was about bees.

Person A: "Las abejas, they were all over the window. So, el exterminador me dijo that they were on the inside of the wall, porque se metían por un agujero on the outside." [The bees, they were all over the window. So, the exterminator told me that they were on the inside of the wall, because they would get in through a hole on the outside.]

Person B: "Por ejemplo abejas son, "bees" y las avispas son "wasps." Yes, they are different kinds." [For example "abejas" are , bees and "avispas" are wasps.]

I provide these examples to demonstrate how discourse analysis can be utilized as an instructional tool to tie the classroom to the community. When applied in my own

classroom, one student discussed the lesson as it pertained to her own language experience. She stated:

I found this exercise...to be very interesting and beneficial as a learner. ...although I do not code-switch much as an adult, it does come naturally to me even though I did not grow up around it. I discovered that I intentionally code switch when the situation calls for it. When I see my neighbors, I have to codeswitch in order to be accepted in their conversation and in order to feel like I belong there conversing with them. ...I was speaking English with a fellow student who speaks mainly in Spanish and she seemed a bit reserved at first, so I changed from “English only” to “intrasentential code-switching”. Had I not done this, I think she would have viewed me as “A Hispanic snob that knows Spanish but refuses to speak it!

This study provides substantive evidence to warrant continued research and practice of dialect awareness in the heritage language classroom. With the growing influence of the U.S. Hispanic population, heritage language instruction will become a more present reality in higher education across the nation. Teacher preparation programs should address the needs of this population and examine the pedagogical implications of dialect awareness as an approach that can transform Heritage Language instruction into a dynamic learning process. I contend that teacher preparation should include dialect awareness methodology using the three categories of sociolinguistic content, Panhispanic cultural content, and social-political content as delineated in this study. In doing so, it should also provide grounding in transformative learning theory

(Mezirow, 1997) to guide teachers in their instructional practices.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and The Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education identify integrative learning as “one of the most important goals and challenges of higher education” (Integrative Learning Opportunities, 2004). According to these sources, integrative learning provides deep transformative learning opportunities where students make connections between academic coursework, community engagement, civic responsibility, and pro-active solutions to real-life problems. Researchers have found that such programs create interconnectivity across course material, and prompt greater student success in college populations (Huber & Hutchings, 2004). Since DA connects language to identity, learning to practice, and students to both local and global communities, it is an example of integrative learning that may possibly provide broader humanistic and emancipatory opportunities across populations. Consequently, I encourage Heritage Language researchers and practitioners alike to examine dialect awareness in relation to the theoretical implications and practical goals of transformative learning.

REFERENCES

- Alim, S. (2005). Critical language awareness in the United States: Revisiting issues and revising pedagogies in a resegregated society. *Educational Researcher*, 34(7), 24-32.
- American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) (1997). *On the application of dialect knowledge to education*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaal.org/Default.aspx?pgId=274628>
- Anaya, R. A. (1972). *Bless me, Ultima*. New York: Quinto Sol Publications.
- Andrews, L. (2006). *Language exploration and awareness: A resource book for teachers*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Antón, M. & Dicamilla, F. (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. In *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 233-247.
- Arellano, S. (2000). A hierarchy of requests in California Spanish: Are indirectness and mitigation polite? In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States* (pp. 319-332). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2004). *Integrative Learning: Opportunities to Connect*. Retrieved from http://webshares.northseattle.edu/IS/readings/a_statement_on_integrative_learn
- Atwood, B. (1962). *The regional vocabulary of Texas*. Austin: University of Texas

Press.

Azevedo, M. M. (1992). *Introducción a la lingüística española*. Upper Saddle River, NJ:

Prentice Hall.

Balestra, A., Martínez, G., & Moyna, M. I. (2008). *Recovering the U.S. Hispanic*

linguistic heritage: Sociohistorical approaches to Spanish in the U.S. Houston,

TX: Arte Público Press.

Balkan L. (1970). *Les effets du bilinguisme Français-Anglais sur les aptitudes*

intellectuelles. Bruxelles: Aimav.

Barker, G. C. (1974). Social functions of language in a Mexican-American community.

Acta Americana, 5, 185-202.

Bartel, N. & Axelrod, J. (1973). Non-standard English usage and heading ability in

Black junior high school students. *Exceptional Children*, 3, 653-55.

Beaudrie, S. & Ducar, C. (2005). Beginning level university heritage programs: Creating

a space for all heritage language learners. *Heritage Language Journal*, 3(1).

Retrieved from <http://128.97.165.17/languages/nhirc/journal.asp>

Benjamin, R. (1997). What do our students want? Some reflections on teaching Spanish

as an academic subject to bilingual students. *ADFL Bulletin*, 29, 44-47.

Ben-Zeev, S. (1977). The influence of bilingualism on cognitive strategy and cognitive

development. *Child Development*, 9, 93-122.

Bernal-Enríquez, Y. (2000). Factores socio-históricos en la pérdida del español del

suroeste de los Estados Unidos y sus implicaciones para la revitalización. In

A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic issues and*

- challenges* (pp. 121-136). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Berry, R. & Hudson, J. (1997). *Making the jump: A resource book for teachers of Aboriginal students*. Broome: Catholic Education Office, Kimberly Region, Australia.
- Bills, G. & Vigil, N. (2000). The continuity of change: Nahuatlisms in New Mexican Spanish. In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic issues and challenges* (pp. 137 - 153). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Blanch, L. (1987). Problemas de morfología dialectal en el español de Tejas. In T.A. Morgan, J. F. Lee & B. van Patten (Eds.), *Language and language use: Studies in Spanish* (pp. 97-107). New York: University Press of America.
- Blanch, L. (1989). Anglicismos en el español del suroeste de los Estados Unidos. *Actas del IX Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de hispanistas*. Frankfurt: Vervuert Verlag.
- Blanco, G. (2001). *Español para el hispanohablante*. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency, Publication Distribution Office.
- Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, Handbook I: The cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay Co.
- Bolitho, R., Carter, R., Hughes, R., Ivanic, R., Masuhara, H., & Tomlinson, B. (2003). Ten questions about language awareness. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 251-259.
- Bullock, B. & Toribio, A. J. (2009). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Burch, R. (1989). On phenomenology and its practices (part 1). *Phenomenology &*

Pedagogy, 7, 187- 217.

Bustamante-López, I. (2009). Constructing linguistic identity in Southern California. In M. Niño-Murcia & J. Rothman (Ed.), *Bilingualism and identity: Spanish at the crossroads with other languages* (pp. 301 - 332). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Cable News Network (1996) Jackson, Oakland school board discuss ebonics. Retrieved on Jan 10, 2009 from http://articles.cnn.com/1996-12-30/us/9612_30_ebonics_1_english-oakland-distinct-language-black-students?_s=PM:US

Callahan, L. (2001). *Spanish/English codeswitching in fiction: A grammatical and discourse function analysis*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of California, Berkeley, CA.

Callahan, L. (2007). Spanish/English codeswitching in service encounters: Accommodation to the customer's language choice and perceived linguistic affiliation. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*, 26(1): 15-37.

Candelier, M. (2004). The introduction of language awareness into the curriculum: Awakening to languages. In M. Candelier (Ed.), *Janua Linguarum - The gateway to languages* (pp. 15-18). Kapfenberg, Austria: Council of Europe Publishing.

Cantero, M. (2000). Adapted borrowings in Spanish: A morphogrammatic hypothesis. In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic issues and challenges* (pp. 177-183). Somerville, MA: Cascadia Press.

Carrasco, R. & Riegelhaupt, F. (2003). META: A model for the continued acquisition

- of Spanish by Spanish/English bilinguals in the United States. In A. Roca and M. C. Colombi (Eds.), *Mi lengua: The acquisition of Spanish as a heritage language – insights from research and instruction* (pp. 170-98). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Cervantes-Rodríguez, A. M., & Lutz, A. (2003). Coloniality of power, immigration, and the English-Spanish asymmetry in the United States. *Nepantia: Views from the South*, 4(3): 523-560.
- Chambers, J. K. (2006). Patterns of variation including change. In P. Trudgill, J. K. Chambers, & N. Schilling-Estes (Eds.), *The handbook of language variation and change* (pp. 349-372). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Chauncey, K., Grainger, J. & Holcomb, P. (2007). Code-switching effects in bilingual word recognition: A masked priming study with event-related potentials. *Brain and Language*, 105, 161-174.
- Christie, F. (2005). *Classroom discourse analysis: A functional perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Clair, N. & Adger, C. (1999). *Professional development for teachers in culturally diverse schools*. Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/profdvpt.html>
- Clegg, J. H. (2000). Morphological adaptation of anglicisms into the Spanish of the Southwest. In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States*. (pp. 154-161). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Coelho, E. (1998). *Teaching and learning in multicultural schools*. Bristol, PA:

Multilingual Matters.

- Collier, M. J., & Thomas, M. (1988). Cultural identity: An interpretive perspective. In Y. Y. Kim and W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 99-120). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Coryell, J., Potowsky, A. & Clark, C. (2010). Cultural fantasy narratives and heritage language learning: A case study of adult heritage learners of Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal*. 94(3), 453-469.
- Cota-Cárdenas, M. (1985). *Puppet*. Austin, TX: Relámpago Press.
- Coulmas, F. (2005). *Sociolinguistics: The study of speakers' choices*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Craddock, J. R. (1976). Lexical analysis of south-west Spanish. In J.D. Bowen & J. Ornstein (Eds.) *Studies in Southwest Spanish*. Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Crowell, S. C., Kolba, E. D., Stewart, W. A., & Johnson, K. R. (1974). *Takacross: Materials for teaching English as a second dialect. Teachers handbook and student activity book*. Montclair, NJ: Caribou Associated.
- Cummins, J. (1978). Metalinguistic development of children in bilingual education programs: Data from Irish and Canadian English-Ukrainian programs. In M.S. Paradis (Ed.), *The Fourth Locus Forum*. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.
- Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Los Angeles, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Dirr, P. (2004). Classroom observation protocols: Research tools for evaluating program impact. *Elementary and secondary education*, U.S. Department of Education.

Retrieved from <http://www.schoolsmovingup.net/cs/smu/view/e/79>

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman.

Feigenbaum, I. (1970). The use of nonstandard in teaching standard. In R.W. Fasold and R. Shuy (Eds.), *Teaching standard English in the inner city*. (pp. 87-104) Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Fishman, J. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia: Diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* 23, 29-38.

Fishman, J. (2007). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; Diglossia with and without bilingualism. In L. Wei (Ed.), *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 47 - 54). London: Routledge.

Fogel, H., & Ehri, L. C. (2000). Teaching elementary students who speak Black English vernacular to write in standard English: Effects of dialect transformation practice. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 212-235.

Fought, C. (2006). *Language and ethnicity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Friere, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum Publishing.

Frontier Health Care, *Why being bilingual can increase your job prospects*.

Retrieved on April 5, 2010, from

<http://www.frontierhealthcareservices.com/travelnursinginohio/career-management/why-being-bilingual-can-increase-your-job-prospects>

Gafaranga, J. (2007). *Talk in two languages*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Galindo, L. (1996). Caló and taboo language use among Chicanas: A description of

- linguistic appropriation and innovation. In L. Galindo & M. D. Gonzáles (Eds.), *Speaking Chicana: Voice, power, and identity* (pp. 175-193). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Gallois, C., Ogay, T. & Giles, H. (2005). Communication accommodation theory. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about Intercultural Communication* (pp. 121-148). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- García, A. M. (2004). *Narratives of Mexican American women: Emergent identities of the second generation*. New York: Altamira press.
- García, M. E. & Tallon, M. (2000). Estar in Mexican-American Spanish: Phonological or morphological variability? In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States* (pp. 348-359). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Gingerich, E. F. (2007). Mandatory Spanish instruction in American undergraduate business schools: Responding to the demands of a growing consumer base. *The Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, 7(4), 1-18.
- Grima, A., Candelier, M., Fitzpatrick, A., Halink, R., Heywork, F., Muresan, L., & Newby, D. (2003). *Challenges and opportunities in language education: The contributions of the European Centre for Modern Languages 2000-2003*. Kapfenberg, Austria: European Centre for Modern Languages Council of Europe Publishers.
- Guitart, J. (2007, April). Alternatives to easy poetry: Teaching Experimental Poetry to Children and Grownups. In B. Imhoff (Chair), *Poetry and Pedagogy*. Presented at the Poetry of the Americas Symposium. Texas A&M University, College Station,

TX.

Gutiérrez, M. (2003). Simplification and innovation in U.S. Spanish. *Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 22(2), 169-184.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). *Learning how to mean*. London: Edward Arnold.

Harris, J., Kamhi, A. & Pollock, K. (2000). *Literacy in African American communities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Hawkins, E. (1979). Language as a curriculum study. In G. Perren (Ed.), *The mother tongue and other languages in education*. NCLE Papers 2. London: CILT.

Hawkins, E. (1999). Foreign language study and language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 8(3&4), 124-142.

Heinz, B. (2001). 'Fish in the river': Experiences of bicultural bilingual speakers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 20(1), 85-107.

Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference Report (2000). *Center for Applied Linguistic*. University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org>.

Hickey, C. (dissertation in progress). *An analysis of the use of the Spanish language and the attitudes toward its use in the South Texas borderlands: A case study of Laredo 1860-1930*.

Hidalgo, M. (1993). The dialectics of language maintenance and language loyalty in Chula Vista, CA: A two-generation study. In A. Roca & J. M. Lipski (Eds.), *Spanish in the U.S.: Language contact and diversity* (pp. 47-71). Berlin: Mouton.

- Hidalgo, M. (2001). Spanish language shift reversal on the U.S. Mexico border and the extended third space. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 1(1), 57-75.
- Hidalgo, M. (2009). Afterward: Indicators of bilingualism and identity: Samples from the Spanish-speaking world. In M. Niño-Murcia & J. Rothman (Eds.), *Bilingualism and Identity: Spanish at the crossroads with other languages* (pp. 333-358). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Hinojosa, R. (1981). *Dear Rafe mi querido Rafe*. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press.
- Holsti, O. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Wang, S. (2008). Who are our heritage language learners? Identity and biliteracy in heritage language education in the United States. In D. M. Binton, O. Kagan, & S. Bauckus (Ed.), *Heritage language education* (pp. 3-38). New York: Routledge.
- Huber, M.T. & Hutchings, P. (2004). *Integrative learning: Mapping the terrain*. Washington DC: The Association of American Colleges and Universities, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Jacobson, R. (2009). The social implications of intra-sentential code-switching. In J. Amastae & L. Elías-Olivares (Eds.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic aspects*, (pp. 154-165). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- James, C. & Garrett, P. (Eds.) (1991). *Language awareness in the classroom*. London: Longman.

- Jia, G., Kohnert, K., Collado, J., & Aquino-García, F. (2006). Action naming in Spanish and English by sequential bilingual children and adolescents. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 49*, 588-602.
- Kachru, B. & Nelson, C. (2009). World Englishes. In S. L. McKay & N. Hornberger (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 71-102.
- Kells, M. H. (2006). Tex Mex, metalingual discourse, and teaching college writing. In S. J. Nero (Ed.), *Dialects, Englishes, Creoles, and education* (pp. 185 - 204). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Koike, D. & Klee, C. (2003). *Lingüística aplicada: Adquisición del español como segunda lengua*. Danvers, MA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kondo-Brown, K. (2003). *Heritage language instruction for post-secondary students from immigrant backgrounds*. Retrieved from <http://www.international.ucla.edu/article.asp?parentid=3600>.
- Kondo-Brown, K. (2010). Curriculum development for advancing heritage language competence: Recent research, current practices, and a future agenda. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 24-41.
- Krashen, S. D. (1975). The critical period for language acquisition and its possible bases. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 263*, 211-224.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Teaching*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. D. & Terrell, D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the*

- classroom*. London, UK: Prentice Hall Europe.
- Kron, F. (1998). Cultural and ideological dimensions of language awareness. In W. Tulasiewicz & J. Zajda (Eds.), *Language awareness in the school curriculum* (pp. 33-40). Albert Park, Australia: High Press Academic.
- Lacorte, M. & Canabal, E. (2005). Teacher beliefs and practices in advanced Spanish classrooms. *Heritage Language Journal*, 3(1), 83-107.
- Lance, D. (1969). Spanish-English code-switching: El lenguaje de los Chicanos, A brief study of Spanish-English bilingualism: Final Report, *Research Project ORR-Liberal Arts-15504*, College Station, TX: Texas A&M University.
- Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Leeman, J. (2005). Engaging critical pedagogy: Spanish for native speakers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 21-31.
- Lindlof, T. R. & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lipski, J. M. (1977). Code-switching and the problem of bilingual competence. In M. Paradis (Ed.), *Fourth LACUS Forum* (pp. 263-77). Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.
- Lipski, J. M. (2000). U.S. Spanish: An overview of the issues. In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic issues and challenges* (pp. 1-41). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Lipski, J. M. (2008). *Varieties of Spanish in the United States*. Washington DC:

Georgetown University Press.

- Long, M. H. & Sato, C. J. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teacher's questions. In W. H. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in language acquisition* (pp. 268-285). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lowe, R. (2004). *Rethinking schools*, 18(3). Retrieved from:
http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/18_03/stra183.shtml
- Luke, A. (2005). Two takes on the critical. In B. Norton & K. Tookey (Ed.), *Critical pedagogues and language learning* (pp. 21-29). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- MacGregor-Mendoza, P. (2000). Aquí no se habla Español: Stories of linguistic repression in southwest schools. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24, 333-345.
 Retrieved from <http://brj.asu.edu/v244/articles/art3.html>
- MacSwan, J. (1999). *A minimalist approach to intrasentential code-switching*. New York: Garland.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Martin-Beltrán, M. (2006). Opportunities for language exchange among language-minority and language-majority students. Dissertation, Ann Arbor, MI: Stanford University.
- Martínez, G. (2003). Classroom based dialect awareness in heritage language instruction: A critical applied linguistic approach. *Heritage Language Journal*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www.heritagelanguages.org/>

- Martínez, O. (1994). *Border people: Life and society in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Mejías, H. (1980). *Préstamos de lenguas indígenas en el español americano del siglo XVII. México DF, México*: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas.
- Mendoza-Denton, N. (2006). Language and identity. In P. Trudgill, J. K. Chambers, & N. Schilling-Estes, N. (Eds.), *The handbook of language variation and change* (pp. 475-499). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Merrigan, G. & Huston, C. L. (2004). *Communication research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, J. (2003). *Audible differences: ESL and social identity in schools*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Milroy, L. (1980). *Language and social networks*. Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Montes-Alcalá, C. (2000). Attitudes towards oral and written code-switching in Spanish-English bilingual youths. In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic issues and challenges* (pp. 218-227). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Montrul, S. (2005). L2 learners and heritage speakers: Exploring some differences and similarities. *Second Language Research*, 21(3), 199-249. Received from <http://slr.sagepub.com/content/21/3/199>

- Montrul, S. (2008, April). Morphological errors in L2 learners and heritage language learners. In O. Kagen (Chair), *Heritage language learners as language learners: A quest for theory*. Symposium presented at The American Association for Applied Linguistics. Washington DC.
- Morsch, M. (2009). *Why it pays to be bilingual*. Careerbuilder.com. Retrieved on March 10, 2010 from <http://jobs.aol.com/articles/2009/01/26/why-it-pays-to-be-bilingual/>
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Nealy, M. (2008). *Spanish-language media market in a growth phase*. Retrieved on February 5, 2009 from <http://diverseeducation.com/article/11437/>
- Nero, S. (2006). Language, identity, and education of Caribbean English speakers. *World Englishes*, 25(3 & 4), 501-511.
- Niño-Murcia, M. & Rothman, J. (2008). Spanish contact bilingualism and identity. In M. Niño-Murcia & J. Rothman (Eds.), *Bilingualism and identity: Spanish at the crossroads with other languages* (pp. 11-34). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Norton, B. & Toohey, K. (2004). *Critical pedagogies and language learning*. New York: Cambridge Press.
- Nunan, D. (2005). Classroom research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 225-240). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.
- Oh, J. S. & Au, T. K. (2005). Learning Spanish as a heritage language: The role of sociocultural background variables. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 18(3), 229-241.

On the Radio.Net. Retrieved April 16, 2010:

http://www.ontheradio.net/metro/laredo_tx.aspx.

Otheguy, R. & Stern, N. (2010). On so-called Spanglish. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15(1), 85-100.

Parodi, C. (2008). Stigmatized Spanish inside the classroom and out: A model of language teaching to heritage speakers. In D. Brinton, O. Kagan, & S. Bauckus, (Eds.), *Heritage language education* (pp. 199 - 124). New York: Routledge.

Peal, E. & Lambert, W. E. (1962). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs*, 76(27), 1-23.

Peréa, F. C. & Coll, C. G. (2008). The social and cultural contexts of bilingualism. In J. Altarriba and R. Heredia (Eds.). *An introduction to bilingualism: Principles and processes*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Peyton, K. J., Lewelling, V. & Winke, P. (2001). *Spanish for Spanish speakers: Developing dual language proficiency*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest_pdfs/0109-Peyton.pdf.

Peyton, J. K. (2008). Spanish for native speakers education: The state of the field. In D. Brinton, O. Kagan, & S. Bauckus, (Eds.), *Heritage language education* (pp. 243-256). New York: Routledge.

Pfaff, C. (1979). Constraints on language mixing: Intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English. *Language* 55(2), 291-318.

Pletsch de García, K. (2002). *A sociolinguistic profile of heritage Spanish speakers in*

- the public schools in Laredo, Texas*. Laredo, TX: Texas A&M International University.
- Pletsch de García, K. (2008). ¡Ala! Linguistic innovation and the blending of cultures on the South Texas border. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*, 27(1), 1-16.
- Poplack, S. (1982). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching. In J. Amastae & L. Elías-Olivares (Eds.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic aspects* (pp. 230-263). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Poplack, S., Wheeler, S., Westwood, A. (1989). Distinguishing language contact phenomena: Evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism. *World Englishes*, 8, 389-406.
- Potowski, K. (2002). Experiences of Spanish heritage speakers in university foreign language courses and implications for teacher training. *ADFL Bulletin*, 33, 35-42.
- Potowski, K. & Carreira, M. (2004). Towards teacher development and national standards for Spanish as a heritage language. *Foreign Language Annals* 37(3), 421-431.
- Ramírez, A. (2000). Linguistic notions of Spanish among youths from different Hispanic groups. In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic issues and challenges* (pp. 284-295). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Reiter, R. M. (2000). Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay. A contrastive study of request and apologies. London: Johns Benjamins.
- Resolution on the application of dialect knowledge to education (1997). Retrieved

- April 4, 2008: <http://www.aaal.org/index/php?id=19#dialect>
- Reyes, R. (1978). Language mixing in Chicano Spanish. *Studies in Chicano Spanish*.
Bloomington, IN: IULC, 83-96.
- Rickford, J. (1998). *The ebonics controversy in my backyard: A sociolinguist's experiences and reflections*. Retrieved July 23, 2008:
<http://www.stanford.edu/~rickford/papers/EbonicsInMyBackyard.html>
- Rickford, J. (2006). Linguistics, education, and the ebonics firestorm. In S. J. Nero (Ed.), *Dialects, Englishes, Creoles, and education* (pp. 71 - 92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rickford, A. E., & Rickford, J. R. (2007). Variation, versatility, and contrastive analysis in the classroom. In R. Bayley & C. Lucas (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic variation: Theories, methods and applications* (pp. 276-296). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivera, T. (1987). *...y no se lo tragó la tierra*. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press.
- Rivera-Mills, S. V. (2000). Intraethnic attitudes among Hispanics in a northern California community. In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States* (pp. 377-389). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Roca, A. (1992). *Spanish for U.S. Hispanic bilinguals in higher education*. Eric Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. Retrieved from
<http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/AnaRocaSNS Digest.html>
- Roca, A. (1997). Retrospectives, advances, and current needs in the teaching of Spanish to United States Hispanic bilingual students. *ADFL Bulletin*, 29(1), 37-43.

- Roca, A. (2004). *Nuevos mundos: Lectura, cultura y comunicación* (1 ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Roca, A. (2004). *Nuevos mundos, workbook: Lectura, cultura y comunicación*. Hoboken, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Romaine, S. (1994). *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Romero, M. (2000). Instructional practice in heritage language classrooms. In J. Webb & Miller (Eds.), *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom*, (pp. 135-158). New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Samaniego, F., Rojas, N., Ohara, M., & Alarcón, F. (2005). *El mundo 21 hispano*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sánchez, R. (1972). Nuestra circunstancia lingüística. *El Grito*, 6, 45-74.
- Sánchez, R. (2003). Cartas a Rosa. In E. Olazagasti-Segovia (Ed.), *Sorpresas*. Boston, MA: Heinle.
- Sankoff, D. & Poplack, S. (1981). A formal grammar for code-switching. *Papers in Linguistics* 14(1), 3-46.
- Sawyer, J. (1964). Spanish-English bilingualism in San Antonio, Texas. *Publications of the American Dialect Society*, 41, 7-15.
- Schieffelin, B. & Ochs, E. (Eds.) (1986). *Language socialization across cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwarzer, D. & Petrón, M. (2005). Heritage language instruction at the college level:

- Reality and possibilities. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 568-578.
- Siegel, J. (2002). Pidgins and creoles. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 335-351). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Siegel, J. (2006). Language ideologies and the education of speakers of marginalized language varieties: Adopting a critical awareness approach. *Linguistics and Education*, 17(2), 157-174.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994). *Language contact and change*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (1996). *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (2001). *Sociolingüística y pragmática del español*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Simard, D. & Wong, W. (2004). Language awareness and its multiple possibilities for the L2 classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(2), 96-110.
- Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sobin, R. (1982). Texas Spanish and lexical borrowing. In J. Amstae & L. Elias-Olivares (Eds.) *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic aspects*, (pp. 166-81). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- State of Texas recommended high school program (2010) retrieved on July 2010 from cms.springbranchisd.com/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=JFO5v2dAv9c%3D...
- Station index: The broadcasting web site. Retrieved April 16, 2010.
<http://www.stationindex.com/tv/markets/Laredo>

- Suarez-Orozco, C., Suarez-Orozco, M. & Todorova, I. (2008) *Learning a new land: Immigrant students in American society*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Svalberg, A. (2007). Language awareness and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 40, 287-308.
- Swann, J., Deumert, A., Lillis, T. & Mesthrie, R. (2004). *A dictionary of sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Texas facts and trivia. Retrieved on April 12, 2010 from <http://www.50states.com/facts/texas.htm>.
- Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). Rousing schools to life. *American Educator*, 13 (2), 46-52.
- Thomas, P. (1967). *Down these mean streets*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Thompson, R. (2002, August). African American vernacular English and dialect awareness in English Departments. In M. Hodge (Chair), *Session 8*. Presented at the Society for Caribbean Linguistics Conference. Trinidad and Tobago.
- Thornbury, S. & Slade D. (2006). *Conversation: From description to pedagogy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Timm, L. A. (1975). Spanish-English code-switching: el porqué y how-not-to. *Romance Philology*, 28(4), 473-482.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. New York: Guild for Press.
- Toribio, A. J. (2000). Once upon a time en un lugar muy lejano...Spanish-English

- codeswitching across fairy tale narratives. In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic issues and challenges* (pp. 184-203). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Trujillo, J. A. (2009). Con todos: Using learning communities to promote intellectual and social engagement in the Spanish curriculum. In M. Lacorte & J. Leeman (Eds.), *Español en Estados Unidos y otros contextos de contacto* (pp. 369-386). Vervuet: Iberoamericana.
- Tulasiewicz, W. (1997). Language awareness study group: An international inquiry into language education. *Compare*, 27(1), 91-94.
- Tulasiewicz, W. & Adams, T. (1998). *Teaching the mother tongue in a multilingual Europe*. Glasgow, UK: Kelvin Books.
- Tunmer, W. E., & Herriman, M. L. (1984). The development of metalinguistic awareness: A conceptual overview. In W. E. Tunmer, C. Pratt & M. L. Herriman (Eds.), *Metalinguistic awareness in children: Theory, research and implications* (pp.12-35). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- United States Census Bureau, 2000. Retrieved on March 15, 2009 from <http://www.census.gov/>
- University of California, Los Angeles. (2001). *Heritage language research priorities conference report*. Los Angeles, CA: Author. Available on June 10, 2009 from: www.cal.org/heritage
- Urciuoli, B. (2009). *Whose Spanish? The tension between linguistic correctness and cultural identity*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

- Valdés, G., Lozano, A., & García-Moya, R. (Eds.) (1981). Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic Bilingual. *Teacher's Press*. New York: Columbia University.
- Valdés, G. (1997). The teaching of Spanish to bilingual Spanish-speaking students: Outstanding issues and unanswered questions. In M. C. Colombi & F. Alarcón, *La enseñanza del español a hispanohablantes: Praxis y teoría* (pp. 8-44). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. K. Peyton, D.A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource*. Washington, DC: The Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Valdés, G. & Teschner, R. (2003). *Español escrito: Curso para hispanohablantes bilingües*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Valdés, G., Fishman, J., Chávez, R. & Pérez, W. (2006). *Developing minority language resources: The case of Spanish in California*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- van der Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. London: Longman.
- van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience*. Albany, NY: Suny Press.
- Vega, L. (2008). Social psychological approaches to bilingualism. In J. Altarriba & R. Heredia. *Bilingualism* (pp. 185-198). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Villa, D. (2009). General versus Standard Spanish: Establishing empirical norms for the

- study of U.S. Spanish. In M. Lacorte & J. Leeman (Eds.) *Español en Estados Unidos y otros contextos de contacto: Sociolingüística, ideología y pedagogía* *Spanish in the United States and other contact environments: Sociolinguistics, ideology and pedagogy* (pp. 175-190). Madrid, Spain: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Webb, J. & Miller, B. (2000). *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the classroom*. New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Wheeler, R., & Swords, R. (2006). *Code-switching: Teaching Standard English in urban classrooms*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Wiederholt, T., & Bryant, B. (1992). *Gray oral reading test (3rd ed.)*. Austin, TX: Pro-ed.
- Wolfram, W. (2007) Voices of North Carolina dialect awareness curriculum retrieved on June 7, 2009 from http://www.ncsu.edu/lingistics/research_dialecteducation.php
- Wood, D. J., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology*, 17(2), 89-100.
- Wood, L. A. & Kroer, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis*. London, UK: Sage.
- Yiakoumetti, A., Evans, M., & Esch, E. (2005). Language awareness in a bidialectal setting: The oral performance and language attitudes of urban and rural students in Cyprus. *Language Awareness*, 14(4), 254-260.
- Young, A. & Helot, C. (2003). Language awareness and/or language learning in French primary schools today. *Language Awareness*, 12(3 & 4).
- Zabaleta, F. (2000). Aspectos morfosintácticos del español como lengua materna entre

- universitarios californianos. In A. Roca (Ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States* (pp. 360 - 376). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Zavala, V. & Bariola, N. (2010). "Enra Kopiai, Non Kopiai" Gender, ethnicity and language use in a Shipibo community in Lima. In M. Niño-Murcia & J. Rothman (Eds.). *Bilingualism and identity: Spanish at the crossroads with other languages* (pp. 151-174). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Zentella, A. C. (2002). Latina Languages and Identities. In M. Suárez-Orozco and M. Páez, (Eds.). *Latinos: Remaking America* (pp. 321-338). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

APPENDIX A

PRE-SURVEY

I. Demographic Information

1. Student number:

Answer the following questions by checking the box that best describes you:

2. Age: 18-20 years _____

21-25 years _____

26-30 years _____

31-40 years _____

41-50 years _____

+50 years _____

3. I was born in: _____

City

State

Country

4. The terms(s) that best describe me ethnically is (are):

a. Mexican-American _____

b. Mexican _____

c. Latino/a _____

d. Tejano/a _____

e. Hispanic _____

f. Chicano/a _____

g. Other _____

5. Describe what the term(s) you chose in #4 mean(s) to you:

6. I consider my first language to be:

a. English

b. Spanish

c. English and Spanish

e. Other (please

explain)_____

II. Language Experience:

Instructions: Check the boxes that best represent your language experience:

I usually speak _____ with this individual.

7. Relationship	Spanish	English	Spanish Combination	Other
			or	
			English	
a. mother				
b. father				
c. maternal grandparents				
d. paternal grandparents				
e. brothers				
f. sisters				
g. friends my age				
j. at religious ceremonies				

B. [DOMAINS]

Instructions: Check all that apply to you by answering the following:

I usually speak _____ when I am in this place.

8. Domain	Spanish	English	Spanish Combination	Other
		or		
		English		
a. at home				
b. in class				
with the professor				
c. at the supermarket				
d. at social events with my family				
e. at the bank				
f. ordering food in a restaurant				
g. After class with my friends				
h. After class with my professor				
i. at social events with my friends				
j. at religious ceremonies				

C. [WORK] Instructions: Answer the following ONLY if you work:

9. I usually speak this language with these people at work.

Work

9. Person	Spanish	English	Spanish Combination	Other
		or		
		English		
a. Boss during work				
b. Coworkers during work				
c. Boss and Coworkers in meeting				
d. Boss and coworkers at lunch				
e. Boss after work				

Education

10. Grade	Spanish	English	Spanish Combination	Other
		or		
		English		
a. Pre-kinder				
b. K-3				
c. 4-6				
d. 7-8				
e. 9-12				

III. Knowledge and Attitudes:

Instructions: Please mark the answer that best represents your sentiments:

11. I feel that I understand Spanish very well.
12. I feel that I understand English very well.
13. I feel that I write Spanish very well.
14. I feel that I write English very well.
15. I feel that I read Spanish very well.
16. I feel that I read English very well.
17. I feel comfortable speaking English with a native English-speaking person who doesn't speak Spanish (ex. In Dallas, TX).
18. I feel comfortable speaking Spanish with a native Spanish-speaking person who doesn't speak English (ex. in Monterrey, México)
19. I remember a time when I felt uncomfortable speaking English with a professor.
20. I remember a time when I felt uncomfortable speaking Spanish with a professor.
21. I feel comfortable speaking Spanish in formal situations.
22. I feel confident participating orally in Spanish literature classes.
23. I tend to combine both English and Spanish when I am with friends and family.
24. I am proud of the way my immediate family speaks Spanish.
25. I am proud of the way my immediate family speaks English.
26. I think people who mix English and Spanish when they talk don't know Spanish very well.
27. I think people who mix English and Spanish when they talk don't know English very well.

28. I think people who mix English and Spanish do so for different reasons.
29. I think people should speak either English or Spanish, not both.
30. I think mixing English and Spanish is appropriate in certain places and with certain people.

IV. Recorded Dyadic Conversations (31-103)

Participants listen to two sets of conversations. The first set is staged at a university financial aid office where a prospective student receives information. Each of the five conversations are similar in context; however, they differ in degrees of formality across Spanish and English: Formal Spanish, semi-formal Spanish, informal vernacular Spanish using code-switching, semi-formal English, Formal English. Respondents are asked several questions of language use related to domain, social status, and language ability.

Instructions: You will now hear a series of conversations. Answer the set of questions for each conversation before proceeding to the next conversation.

Conversation Set I: A Financial Aid Office Informational Exchange.

Conversation 1.a

[conversation 1.a is a semi-formal Spanish conversation. No codeswitching is employed].

31. I would most likely speak in this style of Spanish at a university financial aid office.
32. Speakers will talk this way if they are fluent in both English and Spanish.
33. Speakers will talk this way if they are more fluent in one language than another.

- 34. Speakers will talk this way if one person is in a position of authority and the other is not.
- 35. Speakers will talk this way if both are on the same level of social status.
- 36. Speakers will talk this way if they know each other well.
- 37. Speakers will talk this way if they are acquaintances.
- 38. Speakers will talk this way if they have just met.
- 39. I think speaker gets her message across in this conversation.
- 40. I disapprove of this style of speaking for this setting.
- 41. I think this style of speaking is appropriate for this setting.

Conversation 1.b

[Conversation 1.b is a semi-formal English conversation. No code-switching is employed.]

- 42. I would most likely speak in this style of English at a university financial aid office.
- 43. Speakers will talk this way if they are fluent in both English and Spanish.
- 44. Speakers will talk this way if they are more fluent in one language than another.
- 45. Speakers will talk this way if one person is in a position of authority and the other is not.
- 46. Speakers will talk this way if both are on the same level of social status.
- 47. Speakers will talk this way if they know each other well.
- 48. Speakers will talk this way if they are acquaintances.
- 49. Speakers will talk this way if they have just met.

50. I think speaker gets her message across in this conversation.

51. I disapprove of this style of speaking for this setting.

52. I think this style of speaking is appropriate for this setting.

Conversation 1.c

[Conversation 1.c is a vernacular Spanish conversation where code-switching is employed].

53. I would most likely speak in this style at a university financial aid office.

54. Speakers will talk this way if they are fluent in both English and Spanish.

55. Speakers will talk this way if they are more fluent in one language than another.

56. Speakers will talk this way if one person is in a position of authority and the other is not.

57. Speakers will talk this way if both are on the same level of social status.

58. Speakers will talk this way if they know each other well.

59. Speakers will talk this way if they are acquaintances.

60. Speakers will talk this way if they have just met.

61. I think speaker gets her message across in this conversation.

62. I disapprove of this style of speaking for this setting.

63. I think this style of speaking is appropriate for this setting.

Conversation 1.d

[Conversation 1.d is a formal English conversation].

64. I would most likely speak in this style at a university financial aid office.

65. Speakers will talk this way if they are fluent in both English and Spanish.

- 66. Speakers will talk this way if they are more fluent in one language than another.
- 67. Speakers will talk this way if one person is in a position of authority and the other is not.
- 68. Speakers will talk this way if both are on the same level of social status.
- 69. Speakers will talk this way if they know each other well.
- 70. Speakers will talk this way if they are acquaintances.
- 71. Speakers will talk this way if they have just met.
- 72. I think speaker gets her message across in this conversation.
- 73. I disapprove of this style of speaking for this setting.
- 74. I think this style of speaking is appropriate for this setting.

Conversation 1.e

[Conversation 1.e is a formal Spanish conversation.]

- 75. I would most likely speak in this style at a university financial aid office.
- 76. Speakers will talk this way if they are fluent in both English and Spanish.
- 77. Speakers will talk this way if they are more fluent in one language than another.
- 78. Speakers will talk this way if one person is in a position of authority and the other is not.
- 79. Speakers will talk this way if both are on the same level of social status.
- 80. Speakers will talk this way if they know each other well.
- 81. Speakers will talk this way if they are acquaintances.
- 82. Speakers will talk this way if they have just met.
- 83. I think speaker gets her message across in this conversation.

84. I disapprove of this style of speaking.

85. I think this style of speaking is appropriate for this setting.

II. Conversation Set II. A conversation at a social gathering. *The second set of conversations will include three renditions of the same conversation that will take place at a friendly social gathering. Three styles of oral language will be used: formal Spanish, semi-formal Spanish, and informal vernacular Spanish where code-switching is employed. Respondents will be asked several questions of language use related to language form and level of formality.*

Conversation 2.a

[Conversation 2.a uses semi-formal Spanish.]

86. I would most likely speak in this style at a social gathering.

87. Speakers will talk this way to show respect.

88. Speakers will talk this way if they are comfortable with each other.

89. I think speaker gets her message across in this conversation.

90. I think this style of speaking is appropriate for this setting.

91. I disapprove of this style of speaking in this setting.

92. I approve of people speaking this way.

Conversation 2.b

[Conversation 2.b uses vernacular Spanish where code-switching is employed].

93. I would most likely speak in this style at a social gathering.

94. Speakers will talk this way to show respect.

95. Speakers will talk this way if they are comfortable with each other.

- 96. I think speaker gets her message across in this conversation.
- 97. I think this style of speaking is appropriate for this setting.
- 98. I disapprove of this style of speaking in this setting.
- 99. I approve of people speaking this way.

Conversation 2.c

[Conversation 2.c uses formal Spanish].

- 100. I would most likely speak in this style at a social gathering.
- 101. Speakers will talk this way to show respect.
- 102. Speakers will talk this way if they are comfortable with each other.
- 103. I think speaker gets her message across in this conversation.
- 104. I think this style of speaking is appropriate for this setting.
- 105. I disapprove of this style of speaking in this setting.
- 106. I approve of people speaking this way.

APPENDIX B

POST-SURVEY

1. Student Number

2. The terms(s) that best describe me ethnically is (are):

a. Mexican-American _____

b. Mexican _____

c. Latino/a _____

d. Tejano/a _____

e. Hispanic _____

f. Chicano/a _____

g. Other _____

3. Please identify the topics that were covered in SPAN4313.

TOPICS	COVERED	NOT COVERED
Languages in contact		
Styles and registers		
Bilingual Continuum		
Cultural origins of Border Spanish		
Phonological differences in dialects		
Attitudes toward Border Spanish		
Archaisms		
Anglicisms		

Language maintenance	
codeswitching	
Diglossia	
Socialists	
Social motivations for language use	
Pidgins and creoles	
Other	
Other	

4. Of those topics you identified as covered in class above, please answer below:

I believe this topic helped me to have more confidence in my speaking ability in an academic setting.

TOPICS	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Languages in contact			
Styles and registers			
Bilingual Continuum			
Cultural origins of Border Spanish			
Phonological differences in dialects			
Attitudes toward Border Spanish			
Archaisms			

Anglicisms	
Language maintenance	
codeswitching	
Diglossia	
Sociolects	
Social motivations for language use	
Pidgins and creoles	
Other	

5. I believe this topic helped me to understand what it means to be bilingual.

TOPICS	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Languages in contact				
Styles and registers				
Bilingual Continuum				
Cultural origins of Border				
Spanish				
Phonological differences in				
dialects				
Attitudes toward Border				
Spanish				
Archaisms				

Anglicisms	
Language maintenance	
codeswitching	
Diglossia	
Sociolects	
Social motivations for	
language use	
Pidgins and creoles	
Other	

6. Why did learning these topics help you?

7. What types of activities helped you understand what it means to be bilingual?

8. What classroom activities helped you to develop your confidence in speaking Spanish in professional settings?

9. some exercises listed below were completed in class. Please answer the questions to these exercises.

This activity helped me to understand bilingualism more fully.

Exercise/Activity	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Reflective Exercises (Koike)				
Cartas a Rosa				
Hablar en 'F'				

La prueba de estilos/registros	
Los apodos	
Borrowing exercise by Ana	
Roca	

10. Will you use any instructional practices used in this class in your future teaching?

Yes No Not applicable

III. Knowledge and Attitudes:

Instructions: Please mark the answer that best represents your sentiments:

11. I feel that I understand Spanish very well.

12. I feel that I understand English very well.

13. I feel that I write Spanish very well.

14. I feel that I write English very well.

15. I feel that I read Spanish very well.

16. I feel that I read English very well.

17. I feel comfortable speaking English with a native English-speaking person who doesn't speak Spanish (ex. In Dallas, TX).

18. I feel comfortable speaking Spanish with a native Spanish-speaking person who doesn't speak English (ex. in Monterrey, México)

19. I remember a time when I felt uncomfortable speaking English with a professor.

20. I remember a time when I felt uncomfortable speaking Spanish with a professor.

21. I feel comfortable speaking Spanish in formal situations.

22. I feel confident participating orally in Spanish literature classes.
23. I tend to combine both English and Spanish when I am with friends and family.
24. I am proud of the way my immediate family speaks Spanish.
25. I am proud of the way my immediate family speaks English.
26. I think people who mix English and Spanish when they talk don't know Spanish very well.
27. I think people who mix English and Spanish when they talk don't know English very well.
28. I think people who mix English and Spanish do so for different reasons.
29. I think people should speak either English or Spanish, not both.
30. I think mixing English and Spanish is appropriate in certain places and with

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM 1

Scaffolding with a Southwest Dialect: A sociolinguistic study of heritage language learners' classroom discourse

I am being asked to participate in a study that examines how Spanish is taught to Heritage Language Learners. I understand that students in upper division Spanish courses are being asked to participate. The purpose of this study is to determine what pedagogical practices help Spanish language students to learn Spanish language course work.

If I agree to participate in this study, I will be asked to complete a background survey and participate in classroom discussions that will be audio-taped. The survey contains sociolinguistic background information on my language experiences. The classroom audio-taping will be conducted within my regular classroom hours.

This study is confidential. No names or identifying factors will be used in the final written report. All data will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the Department of Language and Literature, at Texas A&M International University. There are no risks associated with this study. Additionally, there are neither personal benefits nor monetary compensation for participation.

My decision to participate or not will not affect my current or future status as a student with Texas A&M International University. If I decide to participate, I am free to refuse to continue at any time if the observation and audio tape recording makes me uncomfortable. I can withdraw at any time without my relations with the University,

job, benefits, etc., being affected. For further questions about this study I can contact Lisa Gardner Flores, Visiting Assistant Professor at (956)-326-2642, lflores@tamiu.edu or Dr. Pletsch de García, faculty chair of this project kdegarcia@tamiu.edu. I can also contact these individuals by mail through Texas A&M International University, 5201 University Blvd., Laredo Texas 78041.

I understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M International University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, I can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. David Beck, the Institutional Review board chairperson, at dbeck@tamiu.edu. I have read and understand the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this consent form.

_____	_____
Participant's signature	Date
_____	_____
Primary Investigator's Signature	Date
_____	_____
Faculty Chair's Signature	Date

APPENDIX D

CONSENT FORM 2

*Promoting Positive Ethnolinguistic identity in the Heritage Language Classroom: An
Examination of Instructional Practices*

I am being asked to participate in a study that examines how Spanish is taught to Heritage Language Learners. I understand that students in upper division Spanish courses for Summer Session II and Fall Semester 2008 are being asked to participate. The purpose of this study is to determine what course content helps Spanish language students to learn Spanish language course work.

If I agree to participate in this study, I will be asked to complete two questionnaires, one at the beginning of the semester and one at the end of the semester. The survey contains sociocultural-linguistic information and will be completed in the multi-media language lab. It will take me less than one hour to complete each questionnaire.

I may also be asked to be a part of a focus group at the end of the semester. This group will discuss the classroom content and instructional practices that occurred while in the upper-division Spanish course.

This study is confidential. No names or identifying factors will be used in the final written report. All data will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the Department of Language and Literature, at Texas A&M International University. there are no risks associated with this study. Additionally, there are neither personal benefits nor monetary compensation for participation.

My decision to participate or not will not affect my current or future status as a student with Texas A&M International University. If I decide to participate, I am free to refuse to continue at any time. For further questions about this study, I can contact Lisa Gardner Flores, visiting Assistant Professor at (956) 326-2642, lflores@tamiu.edu or Dr. Pletsch de García, faculty chair of this project at kdegarcia@tamiu.edu. I can also contact these individuals by mail through Texas A&M International University, 5201 University Blvd., Laredo, Texas 78041.

I understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board - Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M International University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, I can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. David Beck, the Institutional Review board Chairperson, at dbeck@tamiu.edu.

I have read and understand the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction. By entering my name and student ID number electronically, I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I may request a hard copy of this consent form.

Participant's signature

Date

Primary Investigator's Signature

Date

Faculty Chair's Signature

Date

APPENDIX E

SYLLABUS

Problems in the Teaching of Spanish

Course Description: Problems in the Teaching of Spanish. Three semester hours. Conducted in Spanish. Study of the linguistic principles, methodological theories, and classroom techniques conducive to effective and efficient teaching of Spanish as a native or second language. Recommended for prospective teachers. Prerequisite: SPAN 3305 or equivalent course. -TAMIU Catalog 2010-2011

Textbook: Azevedo, Milton M. (2009). *Introducción a la lingüística española*. Prentice Hall. ISBN13: 9780205647040

Required Articles:

Blanco, G. M., Contreras, V. M. & Marquez, J. (2001). *Español para el hispanohablante*. Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/catalog/items/lote09.html>

Carreira, M. (2004). Seeking Explanatory Adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term Heritage Language Learner. Retrieved from <http://www.international.ucla.edu/languages/heritagelanguages/journal/article.asp?parentid=14647>

Koike, Dale A. & Klee, Carol A. (2003). *Lingüística aplicada: Adquisición del español como segunda lengua*. (Chapter 8). Wiley & Sons. ISBN 0-471-01391-9

Martínez, G. (2003). Classroom based dialect awareness in heritage language instruction: A critical applied linguistic approach. *Heritage Language Journal*. <http://www.international.ucla.edu/languages/heritagelanguages/journalarticle.asp?parentid=3621>.

Potowski, K. (2005). *Fundamentos de la enseñanza del español a los hispanohablantes en los EE.UU.* Madrid: Arco Libros .

Roca, A. (2005). *Nuevos Mundos: Lectura, cultura y comunicación* (1 ed.). Hoboken, MA: John Wiley & Sons.

Sánchez, R. (2003). Cartas a Rosa. In Olazagasti-Segovia (Ed.). *Sorpresas*. Boston, MA: Heinle.

Course Learning Outcomes

After completing this course, the student will be able to:

1. Demonstrate superior critical thinking skills on social issues related to the use of Spanish as a heritage language in the United States.
2. Explain appropriate pedagogical practices for heritage language learners.
3. Demonstrate a general understanding of linguistics as it pertains to the phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics of the Spanish language.

Course Format and Expectations: Active participation in class is strongly encouraged. Students are expected to actively listen to lectures, read the weekly material prior to class, contribute to class discussions, and participate in class presentations. The course is structured in a cooperative learning format. It includes lectures, discussions, in-class activities, and presentations.

Evaluation: All assignments must be completed to pass the course. Assignments are due in the designated *Angel Drop Box*. Late Assignments will not be accepted.

The Angel Gradebook will not be used except to provide raw scores for individual assignments. It will NOT provide a current grade status at any time. Please do not rely on the Angel Gradebook to tell you if you are doing well in this class or not.

Grading Policy: A standard letter grading scale will be used.

A = 100-90

B = 89-80

C = 79-70

D = 69-60

F = 59 –Lower

Oral Presentations and Written Reports (2 @ 15% each)	30%
Homework	10%
Journals	10%
Participation (Group Work) and Quizzes	10%
Research paper	20%
Final Exam	20%

Make-Ups: If a student has to miss a session or exam because of medical or other compelling reasons, an exam will be scheduled ONLY under the following conditions: the student notifies the instructor BEFORE the session about his or her inability to attend the session, the student is able to provide a document providing a reason for his or her absence during the session.

Other classroom policies to consider: Respect your fellow students. Do not talk when someone else has the floor. Feel free to courteously share your ideas with the

class. We all learn from each other. Class begins at 6:00 p.m. You are considered tardy if you are not in your seat and ready to work at the time class begins.
Personal electronic devices of any type are not allowed in the classroom.

Other Pertinent Course Information in Spanish

Presentaciones: Las presentaciones orales sobre temas asignados serán de 10 minutos de exposición y 5 minutos para preguntas y comentarios. Se deberá entregar además un resumen de la presentación junto con la lista de referencias (2 a 3 hojas).

Discusiones: Una vez durante el semestre el alumno se hará cargo de organizar un debate o discusión relacionado al tema de la semana. El objetivo de este trabajo es lograr que se realice una lectura más profunda de un tema de interés personal, mejorar las habilidades de presentación oral y agudizar su capacidad crítica. La discusión o debate debe centrarse en los temas más importantes y controversiales que surgen de la lectura y sus aplicaciones prácticas. Se calificará la claridad y organización de la presentación, la demostración de un buen entendimiento del tema y la capacidad de hacer conexiones y reflexionar críticamente sobre el tema presentado.

Trabajos y reflexiones (temas para profundizar): Para los trabajos de reflexión deberás escribir un ensayo crítico sobre un tema asignado. El trabajo consistirá en 1 página, escrita en computadora a doble espacio, con letra Times New Roman tamaño 12. Se debe demostrar un entendimiento del tema y la capacidad de analizar, hacer conexiones y criticar las cuestiones más importantes. Los trabajos de aplicación práctica (que se realizarán en grupo) consistirán en la creación de una actividad relacionada con los temas pedagógicos vistos.

Trabajo final: El propósito del trabajo final es desarrollar una idea de investigación, partiendo de una pregunta concreta, y llegar a conclusiones válidas que la contesten.

El trabajo final:

- puede ser la continuación de cualquiera de los temas vistos durante el semestre.
- puede ser cualitativo o cuantitativo en el aula de clase.
- debe contener una reseña de la literatura, la metodología del estudio (que incluya preguntas, diseño, instrumentos, participantes y procedimientos), los resultados, la discusión y la conclusión (12 páginas).
- incluye además una Presentación oral (10 minutos) que se debe organizar la presentación en formato *Powerpoint* seleccionando los puntos más importantes y presentándolos con claridad.

Durante la última semana de clase, los alumnos presentarán su trabajo para recibir consejos y recomendaciones del resto de la clase, además de aprender del trabajo realizado por sus compañeros.

Asistencia y participación: Más de dos (2) ausencia y toda ausencia injustificada perjudicará la calificación final. Las llegadas tarde a clase también afectarán la nota de asistencia. La nota de participación bajará 5 puntos por cada ausencia adicional. Si tiene que faltar a clase debido a una emergencia, favor de comunicarse conmigo por correo electrónico. Las llegadas tardías también perjudicarán la nota final.

Exámenes relámpago: Además del examen programado en el calendario, esperen pruebas sorpresa en cualquier momento de cualquier clase. No existe la posibilidad de reponer estas pruebas fuera de clase.

Las lecturas asignadas son obligatorias. Los estudiantes deben llegar puntualmente a clase, venir preparados para discutir a fondo las lecturas asignadas, participar activamente en clase y realizar todos los trabajos escritos, ejercicios y prácticas. Todas las actividades y los trabajos forman una parte integral de la nota final.

Todos los trabajos deberán ser escritos en computadora y entregados por *Turnitin*. No se aceptan los trabajos enviados por correo electrónico.

No habrá la posibilidad de tomar exámenes fuera del horario concertado, a menos que el estudiante haya faltado debido a una emergencia y proporcione una excusa por escrito.

6. Las reflexiones y tareas se ajustarán al siguiente formato:

- escritas en computadora
- tamaño carta
- doble espacio
- tipo y márgenes normales
- letra tamaño 12

7. Los trabajos académicos se deben de escribir con un español estándar.

HORARIO DE CLASES: Los temas, las lecturas y las fechas de entrega pueden ser modificadas con previo aviso a los estudiantes de acuerdo a las necesidades del curso.

Semana	TEMA	CAPÍTULOS/ Las lecturas deben realizarse antes de cada clase	TAREA	FECHA DE ENTREGA
1	Introducción. Programa de estudios. Objetivos de la clase.		Explicar sus antecedentes lingüísticos. Tarea: El continuo Bilingüe.	

	Capítulo 1: La lengua española en el mundo	pp. 1-20 Potowski (2005)	Tema para profundizar Ejercicio A. La presencia del español en nuestra comunidad p. 21	El continuo bilingüe. (Para discutir en clase)
2	Capítulo 1: La lengua española en el mundo Recursos en el sitio de la Real Academia Española www.rae.es	Práctica p. 20	-Debate	
	Capítulo 2: Lenguaje, lengua y lingüística	pp.24-36 Koike (2003)	Preparar una presentación en formato ppt. (asignada)	Entregar en Angel: Tema para profundizar Ejercicio A. La presencia del español en nuestra comunidad p. 21
3	Capítulo 2: Lenguaje, lengua y lingüística	pp.36-46	Actividad 2.1 Manifestaciones del lenguaje oral y escrito p. 25	presentaciones
	Capítulo 3: Los sonidos del habla vocales y sílabas	pp. 53-56	Tema para profundizar Ejercicio A. Diferencias y semejanzas entre las pronunciaciones p. 74	Entregar en Angel: Actividad 2.1 Manifestaciones del lenguaje oral y escrito p. 25
4	Capítulo 3: Los sonidos del habla, consonantes	pp. 59-66		
	Capítulo 3: Los sonidos del habla, prosodia	pp. 67-70	Ejercicio A. Diferencias y semejanzas entre las pronunciaciones p. 74	Entregar en Angel: Tema para profundizar
5	Capítulo 4: fonología Estructura silábica	pp. 94-96	Tema para profundizar: Ejercicio B –dificultades p. 104	
	Capítulo 4: fonología comparación: fonemas españoles e ingleses	pp. 96-98		Ejercicio B – dificultades p. 104

6	El hispanohablante de herencia	Carreira, M.		
		pp. 106-144 Blanco (2001)	Debate	Aplicar los conceptos aprendidos hasta ahora.
7	Capítulo 5: Morfología		Preparar una presentación en formato ppt. (asignada)	
	Capítulo 5: Morfología	Roca (2005)		presentaciones
8	Capítulo 5: Morfología			
	VACACIONES DE PRIMAVERA			
9	El hispanohablante de herencia	pp. 145-147	Escoger un tema para el trabajo final y entregar una propuesta a la instructora.	Para discutir en clase: los 4 tipos de HHH
	Capítulo 6: La sintaxis I	pp. 176-187		Trabajo en equipo
10	Capítulo 7: La sintaxis II Algunas estructuras específicas	pp. 196-200		Trabajo en equipo
	Capítulo 7: La sintaxis II Algunas estructuras específicas	pp. 259-271	Empezar la búsqueda bibliográfica para el trabajo final.	
11	Capítulo 9: Variación regional	pp. 285-315	Debate	
	Capítulo 9: Variación regional		Preparar una presentación en formato ppt. (asignada)	
12	Capítulo 10: Variación social	pp. 316-345	Debate	
	Capítulo 10: Variación social			presentaciones

13	Capítulo 11: Variación contextual		Preparar una presentación en formato ppt. (asignada)	
	Capítulo 12: El español en los Estados Unidos	pp. 346-377 Sánchez (1993)	Temas para profundizar: Ejercicio C. Publicaciones en español p. 373	presentaciones
14	Capítulo 12: El español en los Estados Unidos	Martínez, G. (2003)	Entregar borrador del trabajo final	Temas para profundizar: Ejercicio C. Publicaciones en español p. 373
	Presentaciones del trabajo final			
15	Presentaciones del trabajo final			CBDA: Aplicar los conceptos
	Repaso para el examen final			
16	Día de la lectura			
	EXAMEN FINAL			EXAMEN FINAL 5:00 p.m. Entregar: Trabajo final en Angel - TurnItIn 12:00 medianoche

APPENDIX F
REGISTROS LINGÜÍSTICOS

Nombre _____

Fecha _____

(Familiar, Neutro, Formal)

_____ No fumes en la casa por favor.

_____ ¿Me pasas la sal?

_____ ¿quieres ir a ver una película esta noche?

_____ El olor era tan gacho que todos se fueron.

_____ Necesito tres huevos para hacer un pastel.

_____ ¡Vete de aquí!

_____ Ella es bien agarrada con la feria.

_____ La cochinita pibil es la especialidad de la casa.

_____ No te hagas el loco.

_____ ¿Cómo lo sabe usted?

_____ Tú mismo te contradices al afirmar que eres incapaz de mentir.

_____ Pos la mera verdad, no tengo ganas de nada.

_____ A los mexicanos les encanta el fútbol

_____ ¿Ya comistes abuelita?

_____ No tome aspirina ni productos que contengan aspirina.

_____ No creo que haiga comido todavía.

_____ ¿Has escuchado la charla de Al Gore sobre el calentamiento global?

_____ ¡Eres un fresa!

_____ La troca se quedó sin gasolina.

_____ El perfume de Paulina Rubio smells like cookies recién sacaditas del
horno.

VITA

Name: Helen Lisa Gardner Flores

Address: Texas A&M International University
5201 University Boulevard
Laredo, Texas 78041

Email Address: lflores@tamiu.edu

Education: B.A., General Studies, The Evergreen State College, Olympia, WA
M.A., Sociology, Texas A&M International University, Laredo, TX
Ph.D., Hispanic Studies, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX

Current Position: Visiting Assistant Professor/International Language Institute Director
Texas A&M International University